

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, June 3, 1988

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we pray for all good things—for health and strength, for wisdom and nurture, for faith and hope. On this day we pray for peace, peace in our hearts and peace in our world. Help us to believe that in spite of the very grave concerns that touch each heart, we still may have that peace that passes all human understanding, that assurance and inner confidence that Your presence and Spirit can give.

For this we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## DEDICATION OF WAYNE COUNTY, OH, VETERANS' MEMORIAL

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday I was privileged to participate in the dedication of the Wayne County, OH, Veterans' Memorial. Duty, honor, country. This is the theme of the Wayne County Memorial, dedicated to the 293 Wayne County citizens who served and died in the two World Wars, Korea, and Vietnam. This memorial, 2 years in the making, was conceived, designed, and implemented by the Joint Veterans Organization of Wayne County and was made possible by over 500 contributions from Wayne County citizens.

The memorial consists of five pillars of blue granite, four of which bear the name of the conflict at the top and has each citizen's name who died in service to our country inscribed on the pillar. The memorial will be an eternal reminder to all who visit that these brave Americans, their courage, and the ideals they fought for will live on in our memory.

Two hundred and twenty-two Wayne County students, ranging from grades 8 to 12, competed for the honor to have their tribute to their fellow citizens inscribed on the memorial. This honor was won by Mark Beckler, who expressed his respect for these men

and women who answered the call of their country and never returned with the phrase: "To cherish liberty, one need only remember how it was earned." This phrase embodies the essence of our dedication to freedom of all people.

## THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF OPTICIANRY

(Mr. RAVENEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine in South Carolina's First District, K. Richard Davenport of Charleston, serves as president of the National Academy of Opticianry, which observes its 25th anniversary this year.

I applaud this volunteer, not-for-profit body, dedicated to improving educational opportunities for all ophthalmic dispensers, and would like to call this anniversary to the attention of my colleagues. In just the past 10 years, the academy has grown to become the largest single opticianry organization in the world, currently listing some 4,560 fellows and members.

The significance of the academy's anniversary lies not in its large membership nor its 25 years of existence, but in its successful cooperation and work with other eye care professionals. They serve the 70-plus million Americans who periodically need vision care. Without vision correction these citizens could not enjoy a satisfactory quality life—or in a majority of cases—earn their livings.

In congratulating President Dick Davenport and the academy for their adult education programs, I wish to add my expectations for their continued progress in serving the eye care needs of all Americans.

## TRIBUTE TO JOHN MANLICH, JR., VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have the opportunity to pay homage to a constituent who is an actual friend of mine; this is a gentleman whom I have come to know and love over the years. It gives me great pleasure to honor him here.

John Manlich, Jr., was recently named as the Baltimore County Senior Adult Volunteer Employment Program's "Volunteer of the Year." John volunteered 1,325 hours of his time in 1987; this is an achievement which prompted Baltimore County Executive Dennis Rasmussen to proclaim April 20, 1988, as "John Manlich, Jr., Day." All of us who know John are not at all surprised by this; I have long thought of him as an exceptional man who has always been willing to share his abilities with others. His is a life which is filled with many examples of voluntarism and community service. Let me introduce you to John—someone whom I am proud to call a fine friend as well as a fine man.

For a long time John worked with the March of Dimes; he rose to the position of vice president for Field Services and helped to arrange polio vaccine trials for Dr. Jonas Salk. He served his country with honors in the 99th Division in the European sector during World War II. John, it can be said, has in the past shown his love of country and its people in many different ways.

However, his zest for helping others has not diminished over the years. He has tirelessly sought to serve his community through such positions as board vice president of the Department of Aging's Senior Craft Gallery, administrator of the Maryland State Police Older Adult Club Crime Prevention Program, and volunteer consultant of the Criminal Justice Services Division of the American Association of Retarded Persons in the State of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I can say with great pride that my district and its people are far better off as a result of John Manlich than it would have been without him.

He has also been a very special friend to me. His talent as a photographer is truly excellent, and there have been many times when I have called on him at only a moment's notice when I needed his skills. He has never let me down, and I hope that he feels able to say the same about me.

I know that mere words cannot hope to fully describe a friendship, yet I hope that they have been able to express the great pride I feel over this special friend and his special accomplishments. Indeed awards are great things, yet friendships are probably the greatest awards there are.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

### TOLL THE BELLS FOR MEMORIAL DAY

(Mr. GUNDERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, last Monday I and many of us as Members of Congress had the unique privilege and opportunity of participating in Memorial Day occurrences across this country, and yet I suspect that you, like me and others, could not help but reflect that Memorial Day unfortunately has become to many people in this country nothing more than another 3 day weekend.

Reflecting upon this, today I and the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the honorable gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. SONNY MONTGOMERY, are introducing legislation which will call upon all churches, synagogues, schools, community centers, and other public buildings, to toll their bells for 1 minute beginning at 11 a.m. on each Memorial holiday in the future.

The purpose of this is in order that all Americans, whether they be at the beach, whether they be at the ballpark, whether they be at community celebrations or wherever they might be, will at least for 1 minute reflect and remember what the real purpose of Memorial Day was, is, and ought to be. In that process, hopefully we as well will again return to paying the proper respect to the men and women who have donated their lives in service to our country.

We call upon all of you to join with us in cosponsoring this legislation and making this a proper tribute.

### SUPPORT BOEHLERT AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4505, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AUTHORIZATION, 1989

(Mr. SENSENBRENNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, later today during consideration of the Department of Energy authorization bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] will offer an amendment to provide for a floor of 25 percent foreign financial participation in the construction of the superconducting super collider.

Adoption of the Boehlert amendment is essential if we are to have burden sharing for this big expensive science project.

I am a strong supporter of the superconducting super collider, but we ought to have the playing field level so that if foreign scientists come and do experiments on this machine, their governments ought to pay for part of the cost to bring it into existence. We have heard much about burden shar-

ing in the context of defense of the free world. In terms of giving the free world its scientific edge, burden sharing is just as valid an argument in this area as it is in the defense cost area.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote for the Boehlert amendment with a strong vote.

### SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SUMMIT

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the news from the summit in Moscow would suggest that not very much really happened, except that people felt good and made friends.

I want to remind my colleagues and the American people today that we have accomplished something very significant and that we should compliment President Reagan for it; that is the signing and subsequent ratification of the INF Treaty.

I want to point out that the INF Treaty with the Soviets bans INF missiles. It reduces nuclear inventories instead of only capping them, as past treaties have done. It establishes a rigorous regime for verification, including intrusive onsite inspections and short-notice challenge inspections. It utilizes newly established nuclear risk reduction centers and it requires nearly four times as many cuts in Soviet warheads as American weapons, because it totally wipes out a class of missiles in which the Soviet Union dominates.

Now, I admit there is much more to be done. We must deal with strategic weapons. We must make progress on the START talks; but I am saying this country and the Soviets have done something that is historic, and President Reagan deserves our commendation for that. Let us not lose sight of the accomplishments embodied in the INF Treaty. It is a step forward, a small step, but a step in the right direction. I think it can lead to conclusion of the START talks that will finally and substantially reduce long-range nuclear weapons in this world.

### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, today this House will discuss the authorization of the SSC, the superconducting super collider. It is a significant investment in our Nation to go forward and build this project. Certainly it is a significant investment in our future.

We will be seeing many amendments today to detract from, to reduce, to delay, to spread the burden sharing across the face of this globe. I think those amendments should be discussed and I think the merits and demerits should be brought forward. For instance, in the case of burden sharing, it is great. I believe in it, but we also must make sure that we make the commitment first so those other nations can come on and make those commitments and those dollars do not flow to other places in the world.

### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Without objection Mr. SENSENBRENNER was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of finding out the schedule for next week, and I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

The schedule for the remainder of the day is the completion of H.R. 4505, the Department of Energy authorization. Upon completion, we will adjourn until noon on Tuesday, June 7.

At that point we will consider the following 11 bills under suspension of the rules:

H.R. 4638, to change effective date for certain elementary and secondary education programs;

H.R. 4416, Library Services and Construction Act authorization extension;

H.R. 4585, to extend the Taft Institute through fiscal 1991;

H.R. 4639, to prevent abuses in the Supplemental Loans for Students Program under part B, title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965;

H.R. 4592, U.S. Institute of Peace authorization extension;

H.R. 4621, to approve the Governing International Fishery Agreement between the United States and the German Democratic Republic;

H.R. 4365, to designate the Richard Cronin National Salmon Station;

H.R. 3966, Children's Television Practices Act;

H.R. 4158, National Appliance Energy Conservation Act Amendments;

H.R. 4379, temporary safe haven for aliens; and

S. 952, to provide greater discretion to the Supreme Court in selecting the cases it will review.

□ 1015

I should also mention at this point that those 11 suspensions, the recorded votes on the suspensions will be postponed until Wednesday, June 8. Further, on Wednesday, June 8, we will meet at noon. We will have the Private Calendar, the postponed votes from Tuesday will take place, and



then we will go to H.R. 3436, the Older Americans Act Technical Amendments, and debate the Pepper bill.

On Thursday, June 9, and Friday, June 10, the House meets at 10 a.m. and we will consider the Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal 1989, subject to a rule, and H.R. 4418, the National Science Foundation authorization for fiscal year 1989, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

Conference reports can be brought up at any time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I have a few questions to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

What time is the gentleman from Michigan expecting that we will be done with recorded votes today?

Mr. BONIOR. If the gentleman will yield, the desire is to finish by 3 o'clock.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. And if this bill is not completed by 3 o'clock, will we stop at 3 or will we continue?

Mr. BONIOR. We will stop at 3 o'clock.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. At what time does the gentleman from Michigan expect votes to take place on Wednesday, June 8? Are the votes that are rolled over on the suspensions going to come up right after the Private Calendar is called, or later on in the day?

Mr. BONIOR. If the gentleman will continue to yield, on Wednesday we will expect an early vote right away. We could have a vote on the Journal, and then we will go right into the postponed votes from suspensions of Tuesday.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. So Members should be advised that there is a possibility of votes shortly after noon on Wednesday?

Mr. BONIOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Finally, what is the intention of the majority leadership relative to votes next Friday?

Mr. BONIOR. There will be votes as was suggested in the calendar that was agreed upon by the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

#### ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 1988

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday, June 7, 1988.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MURTHA]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 1988

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, June 7, 1988, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, June 8, 1988.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MURTHA]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 1988

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MURTHA]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING CALL OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 1988

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Private Calendar be considered on Wednesday, June 8, 1988, instead of Tuesday, June 7, 1988.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MURTHA]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY CIVILIAN ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MURTHA]. Pursuant to House Resolution 460 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4505.

□ 1020

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4505) to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian research and development programs for fiscal year 1989, with Mr. SMITH of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 2, 1988, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill is considered as an original bill for the purposes of amendment and each section is considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1, comprising the entirety of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, is as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Energy Civilian Energy Research and Development Authorization Act for fiscal year 1989".*

#### OPERATING EXPENSES

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1989, subject to section 106, in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for operating expenses for the following civilian research and development programs:

- (1) Fossil energy, \$349,819,000;
- (2) Energy conservation, a total of \$146,876,000, including \$9,992,000 in unobligated balances in industrial process efficiency which has not been included in section 105;
- (3) Energy supply research and development:
  - (a) Solar energy, \$94,679,000;
  - (b) Geothermal energy, \$25,061,000;
  - (c) Supporting research and technical analysis, a total of \$557,701,000, including basic energy sciences, \$389,352,000; basic research user facilities-basic energy sciences, \$99,693,000; general increase for basic energy sciences and basic research user facilities-basic energy sciences, \$9,000,000; energy research analysis, \$3,800,000; university research support, \$26,770,000; university research instrumentation, \$15,000,000; advisory and oversight program direction, \$3,339,000; multiprogram laboratories facility support, \$8,770,000; strategic facilities utilization program, \$1,977,000;
  - (d) Environmental research and development, a total of \$332,856,000;
  - (e) Nuclear fission energy, a total of \$345,990,000, including light water reactors, \$24,300,000; advanced reactors research and development, \$103,500,000; space/defense power systems, \$71,490,000; advanced nuclear systems, \$24,700,000; facilities, \$117,500,000; program direction, \$8,500,000; general reduction, -\$4,000,000;
  - (f) Civilian radioactive waste research and development, \$2,498,000;
  - (g) Remedial action and waste technology, byproducts utilization, \$5,000,000;
  - (h) Magnetic fusion energy, \$330,465,000;
  - (i) Electric energy systems and energy storage systems, \$36,080,000; and
  - (j) Supporting services, policy and management, energy research, \$667,000;
- (4) Geothermal resources development fund, \$72,000;
- (5) General science and research, a total of \$652,916,000 excluding the Superconducting Super Collider project and including high energy and nuclear physics, \$268,044,000; basic research user facilities, \$381,662,000; program direction, \$3,210,000; and,
- (6) Isotope production and distribution fund, \$16,243,000, with expected offsetting revenues of \$16,452,000.

## CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

SEC. 102. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1989, subject to section 106, in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for the acquisition and fabrication of capital equipment not related to construction of the following civilian research and development programs:

- (1) Fossil energy, \$480,000;
- (2) Energy conservation, \$2,083,000;
- (3) Energy supply research and development, a total of \$95,204,000, including solar energy, \$2,592,000; supporting research and technical analysis, \$32,005,000; environmental research and development, \$15,800,000; nuclear fission energy, \$22,350,000 and magnetic fusion energy, \$21,635,000; electric energy systems, \$27,000; and, geothermal energy, \$795,000; and,
- (4) General science and research, \$114,300,000.

## PRIOR YEAR CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 103. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1989, subject to section 106, in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for plant and capital equipment (including planning, construction, acquisition, and modification of facilities, including land acquisition) for the following prior year civilian research and development projects:

- (1) Fossil energy, project numbered 88-F-100, \$3,500,000;
- (2) Nuclear energy, project numbered 86-N-105, \$21,160,000;
- (3) Magnetic fusion energy, project numbered 88-R-92, \$24,000,000;
- (4) Supporting research and technical analysis, a total of \$92,929,000, including projects numbered 88-R-802, \$1,445,000; 88-R-804, \$1,330,000; 88-R-805, \$1,946,000; 88-R-806, \$3,448,000; 88-R-807, \$2,150,000; 88-R-809, \$1,000,000; 88-R-812, \$3,950,000; 88-R-814, \$2,060,000; 88-R-817, \$980,000; 88-R-403, \$6,500,000; 87-R-403, \$4,000,000; 87-R-405, \$9,700,000; 87-R-406, \$30,000,000; 87-R-752, \$600,000; 87-R-753, \$3,600,000; 87-R-755, \$500,000; 87-R-756, \$3,134,000; 87-R-757, \$460,000; 87-R-758, \$1,585,000; 86-R-726, \$464,000; 85-R-706, \$312,000; 85-R-707, \$375,000; 84-ER-103, \$490,000; 88-R-830, \$11,787,000; 86-R-801, \$1,113,000;
- (5) Environmental research and development, project numbered 87-R-130, \$7,610,000; and
- (6) General science and research, a total of \$82,132,000 including projects numbered 86-R-105, \$14,000,000; 87-R-203, \$64,500,000; 86-R-104, \$3,632,000.

## NEW CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 104. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1989, subject to section 106, in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for plant and capital equipment (including planning, construction, acquisition, and modification of facilities, including land acquisition) for the following new civilian research and development projects:

- (1) Fossil energy, a total of \$9,000,000, including projects numbered 89-F-101, \$4,800,000; 89-F-102, \$4,200,000;
- (2) Solar energy, a total of \$4,250,000, including projects numbered 89-C-700, \$4,000,000; and SERI GPP, \$250,000;
- (3) Nuclear energy, a total of \$20,200,000 including projects numbered 89-N-111, \$7,500,000; 89-N-112, \$3,400,000; 89-N-113, \$3,800,000; 89-N-115, \$2,000,000; 89-N-120, \$3,500,000;
- (4) Environmental research and development, project numbered 89-R-120, \$3,500,000;

(5) Magnetic fusion energy, project numbered GP-E-900, \$8,900,000;

(6) Supporting research and technical analysis, a total of \$44,469,000 including projects numbered 89-R-116, \$1,000,000; 89-R-401, \$720,000; 89-R-400, \$4,900,000; 89-R-113, \$1,500,000; 89-R-112, \$1,000,000; 89-R-111, \$668,000; 89-R-110, \$854,000; 89-R-109, \$1,100,000; 89-R-108, \$2,520,000; 89-R-107, \$250,000; 89-R-106, \$200,000; 89-R-105, \$1,625,000; 89-R-104, \$300,000; 89-R-103, \$409,000; 89-R-102, \$645,000; 89-R-101, \$150,000; 89-R-100, \$350,000; 89-R-770, \$2,500,000; 89-R-600, \$1,580,000; 89-R-601, \$20,000,000; GPP-strategic facilities utilization program, \$198,000; 89-R-117, \$2,000,000; and

(7) General science and research, a total of \$45,768,000 including projects numbered 89-R-202, \$15,000,000; 89-R-301, \$11,700,000; GP-E-302, \$5,318,000; 89-R-501, \$1,700,000; GP-E-500, \$500,000; GP-E-103, \$5,750,000; 89-R-201, \$2,600,000 GP-E-300, \$3,200,000.

## UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

SEC. 105. To the extent approved in appropriations acts, the Secretary of Energy is authorized to utilize \$101,370,000 in unobligated balances, which were previously authorized and remain in the accounts of the programs and activities authorized in this act to reduce the sums authorized for the programs and activities in this act, except that this authority is not applicable to the general science and research account; the energy conservation, transportation research and development account; the biological and environmental research account; the environment, safety and health account; and the liquefied gaseous fuels test facility account.

## GENERAL REDUCTION

SEC. 106. The amounts authorized herein shall be reduced by a total of 6.63 per centum after credit is applied for unobligated balances authorized for the purposes of this act pursuant to section 105, except that this reduction shall not apply to the energy conservation, transportation research and development account (\$54,800,000); biological and environmental research account (\$249,000,000); environment, safety and health account (\$110,000,000); and the liquefied gaseous fuels test facility account (\$766,000).

## SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER PROJECT

SEC. 107. (1) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1989, subject to section 106, and for fiscal years 1990, and 1991 in accordance with section 660 of the Department of Energy Organization Act for the Superconducting Super Collider project as follows:

- (a) operating expenses, \$64,000,000; \$56,000,000; \$38,000,000; respectively;
- (b) capital equipment, \$16,000,000; \$34,000,000; \$118,000,000; respectively;
- (c) technical systems development, operating expenses and capital equipment for fiscal year 1989, \$67,700,000; and,
- (d) project numbered 89-R-450, \$0.0; \$585,000,000; \$618,000,000; respectively.

(2) FOREIGN PARTICIPATION.—(a) The Secretary shall seek to obtain commitments for foreign participation in the Superconducting Super Collider project at a level not to exceed 25 per centum of the total estimated costs of the project.

(b) The Secretary shall, in a regular and timely fashion, consult with, and by the beginning of fiscal year 1990 submit written reports to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate on: (i) the extent and nature of the assistance which

the Secretary determines is most likely to be made available for the Superconducting Super Collider by foreign entities; (ii) if a 25 per centum foreign participation level is not attainable, then the Secretary of Energy shall explain why he has been unable to attain this level of foreign participation and the implications of the lack of substantial foreign participation with respect to future funding for the project; and (3) the manner in which the competitiveness of domestic industries may be affected by the acceptance of foreign offers of participation in the construction and operation of the Superconducting Super Collider.

(3)(a) ELIGIBLE CONTRACT RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary shall, to the extent feasible, award contracts under this subsection only to—

(i) firms domiciled in the United States which have a majority of ownership by United States nationals; or

(ii) foreign firms based in a country that is contributing substantially to the project; or

(iii) foreign firms that will carry out a majority of all contractual activities within the United States.

(b) None of the limitations in subsection (a) shall apply to joint-ventures with a United States company expressly organized to bid for Superconducting Super Collider contracts.

(c) For contracts that cannot be fulfilled from sources which meet the requirements of subsection (a) or can only be fulfilled at a prohibitively high cost, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in the House and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources in the Senate stating the reasons for the contract award within thirty days of awarding such contract.

(4) FOREIGN MANUFACTURE.—The Secretary of Energy shall not permit more than thirty-three and one-third per centum of any major system or component of the Superconducting Super Collider facility to be manufactured in a foreign country unless the Secretary of Energy finds that such system or component is not available from a domestic manufacturer and the Secretary of Energy provides sixty days notice prior to entering into such a commitment to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(5) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—(a) Except as provided in subsection (2), the Secretary of Energy shall not enter into any agreement to manage or in any way control or support the operation of the Superconducting Super Collider facility with any persons providing advice, program direction, oversight, or other management assistance to the Department of Energy on the Superconducting Super Collider project.

(b) The Secretary of Energy may enter into such agreement with such person if the Secretary of Energy—

(i) finds and reports in writing to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate sixty days prior to consummating such agreement (not including any day on which either House of Congress is not in session because of adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain) that such agreement is necessary, in the best interest of the Nation; and,

(ii) simultaneously publishes such a finding in the Federal Register.



## SCOPE OF AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 108. (1) No funds are authorized under this Act for any purpose other than research, development, and demonstration.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(a) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate;

(b) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program in this Act; and,

(c) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to either such committee unless a period of 30 days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Secretary of Energy or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action.

## ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

SEC. 109. The Secretary of Energy shall annually submit to the Congress, at the time of the release of the President's budget, a three year budget estimate for the Department of Energy, including funding estimates for each major account and new initiative.

## REPORT

SEC. 110. The Assistant Secretary for Environment, Safety and Health shall prepare an annual report on the status of the Department of Energy's environment, safety and health efforts. Such report shall be submitted to the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources by January 1, 1989 and each year following. This report shall include—

(1) an inventory of major environment, safety and health problems that need to be resolved at Department of Energy facilities and how the Secretary of Energy plans to resolve them, including overall cost estimates and timetables;

(2) a list of planned or ongoing activities directed to such problems; and

(3) total funds authorized, appropriated, obligated, expended and planned to be requested by fiscal years for such activities.

## RENAMING FACILITY

SEC. 111. The Los Alamos Neutron Scattering Center is hereby redesignated as the "Manuel Lujan, Jr. Neutron Scattering Center." Any reference in any law, regulation, map, record or other document of the United States to the Los Alamos Neutron Scattering Center shall be considered a reference to the "Manuel Lujan, Jr. Neutron Scattering Center".

## DRUG FREE WORKPLACE

SEC. 112. No funds authorized to be expended under this Act shall be expended in any workplace which is not free from illegal use of controlled substances.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUECHNER

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUECHNER. Amend page 9, lines 2 through 15, to read as follows:

Sec. 107. (1) There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1989 \$100,000,000, for research and development for the superconducting super collider.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, yesterday and today the House is considering major authorization bills to help ensure that the United States maintains its leadership in science and space technology. We have just passed the NASA authorization bill, we are presently considering the Department of Energy Authorization bill and we will conclude later today or tomorrow with the National Science Foundation authorization bill. I think we all agree that increased funding in science and space programs is critical for our Nation to meet the challenge of global competition and to improve the quality of life for all citizens. The chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Mr. ROE, and the vice chairman, Mr. LUJAN, have demonstrated great vision and leadership to bring forth legislation that will contribute to the long-range economic growth and competitiveness of the country.

However, a basic problem exists. There is not enough money to fund all these worthy projects. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee, of which I am a member, has a myriad of new science and space projects to consider this fiscal year. We authorized substantial increases for our space program and the National Science Foundation, as well as the general science programs for the Department of Energy. In all, the general science and space programs was increased 29 percent above the 1988 level. That is why we are offering this amendment that will reduce spending on the superconducting super collider while still providing \$100 million in research and development next year.

My colleagues and I who are offering this amendment are not opposed to these increases. In fact, my friend from Florida, Mr. MACKEY, and I are the only two members on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee that also serve on the Budget Committee. During Budget Committee deliberations, Mr. MACKEY and I fought to ensure that NASA, the National Science Foundation and superconducting super collider received as much funding as possible. However, it became obvious that our plate was too full with new and existing projects and something had to give.

The bill before us will commit substantial amounts of money to research

and construction of the superconducting super collider—\$147 million in fiscal year 1989, \$675 million in fiscal year 1990 and \$774 million in fiscal year 1991. It is estimated that this project will cost at least \$5.4 billion when it is finally constructed. Yet some very critical questions about this project remain unanswered.

The amendment we are offering is an attempt to set priorities among the competing space and science programs. It will delete the outyear funding and provide \$100 million for the SSC during the next fiscal year to continue its research and development. This amendment brings this authorization bill in line with the energy and water appropriations bill which also provided \$100 million in SSC research. Further, the \$100 million in research will allow work to continue in this field, while giving Congress the opportunity to determine unresolved questions such as the extent of foreign participation, State contribution, and relative priority in future budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the SSC. I know it has worthy qualities and it will be an asset to the scientific community, although our CBO states that its results "are not expected to pay for themselves economically for decades, if ever." While I do not enjoy opposing my chairman and vice chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, we must be realistic. If we fund the SSC we will have to reduce our funding for other projects such as the space station.

Mr. Chairman, although the primary purpose of the authorization committee is to set priorities for the Appropriations Committee, it should not act in a vacuum in which fiscal reality is ignored. This bill should guide the appropriations committee, but I believe that in its present form, it will be ignored.

This amendment adds a little dose of reality into the authorization process. It allows Congress to continue important research for the SSC in a fiscally responsible manner. We simply cannot fund a host of space and science programs in the same fiscal year. We must make our choices and allocate our funds in the best possible manner. In essence, we must set priorities among the many conflicting science and space projects.

Finally, I am inserting the following information relating to the budget implications of the SSC to be included for the RECORD:

[From the Congressional Budget Office Staff Memorandum]

## ECONOMIC AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

This Staff Memorandum analyzes aspects of the economic spinoffs from previous particle accelerator efforts and outlines the current budgetary and fiscal potential of alternative sources of financing for the Superconducting Super Collider (SSC) in the

United States. The first section reviews a study published by the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN) on the economic and commercial spinoffs of their particle accelerator program in Geneva, Switzerland. (CERN is the major European Community scientific competitor of the U.S. high-energy physics program.) The section outlines CERN's methodology and conclusions and discusses the applicability of the study to U.S. circumstances.

The second and third sections of the memorandum discuss alternative sources of funds for the U.S. particle accelerator program. The second section focuses on the costs to state governments of contributing to the SSC and places these costs in the context of the states' current indebtedness and their current revenue-raising efforts. (The section does not address the question of the appropriateness or the desirability of a formal state contribution or the precedent such an action might set. Nor does the section address the question of how much weight, if any, the Congress might wish to place on the willingness of any individual state to contribute in the site selection process now underway.<sup>1</sup> The third section looks at potential foreign donors to see how the SSC might fit into their high-energy physics budgets.

#### ECONOMIC SPILLOVERS FROM CERN

In 1984, CERN published a report on the economic spillover effects of its high-energy physics program.<sup>2</sup> This study (referred to as the CERN Contracts Study) concentrated on the secondary economic effects of the procurement contracts let by CERN. The study's intention was to determine whether firms that sold high-technology goods to CERN experienced subsequent increases in non-CERN sales. The CERN Contracts Study concluded that CERN contracts generated three francs in non-CERN sales for every franc in CERN sales. The following sections show that the study substantially overstates the added value of CERN contracts to the economy, although not to the firms involved, and that, largely because of differences in technology, many of the report's conclusions may not be applicable to the United States.

#### Summary of the CERN Contracts Study

The CERN Contracts Study broke the economic effects of CERN into three categories: primary economic effects, secondary effects, and multiplier effects. The CERN Contracts Study focuses on neither the primary economic nor the multiplier effects.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Congress instructed the U.S. Department of Energy not to consider financial incentives in its site selection process.

<sup>2</sup> M. Bianchi-Streit and others, "Economic Utility Resulting from CERN Contracts (Second Study)" (Geneva, Switzerland: European Organization for Nuclear Research, 1984). This study is independent of an earlier study, which covered similar topics for an earlier period. The Congressional Budget Office did not analyze the first study.

<sup>3</sup> The primary category is the economic usefulness of the research results themselves. In the case of CERN or the U.S. Superconducting Super Collider (SSC), the research results are not expected to pay for themselves economically for decades, if ever. While early economic use of these results would be welcome, these projects are being undertaken purely for knowledge and any other use of the results should be considered fortuitous. The multiplier effects simply refer to a macroeconomic multiplier, which results from all government purchases of goods and services. These would be roughly the same whether the government were building a highway or a particle accelerator.

Instead, it concentrates on the secondary effects, which are the benefits that come to the firms providing high-technology equipment under contract to CERN.<sup>4</sup>

The CERN Contracts Study used a straightforward methodology: 160 sample high-technology firms that received CERN contracts during the 1973-1982 period were asked how much in additional sales the CERN contracts had generated or would generate during the 1973-1987 period. (Since interviews for the study were conducted between May of 1982 and June of 1984, a substantial portion of the stated gain in sales was, in fact, a forecast.) While the questions asked covered a range of topics—such as how CERN contracts affected management practices, quality control, research and development, and production techniques—the heart of the questioning related to additional sales. For instance, a manager had to estimate how much CERN contracts had improved production techniques and then estimate how much the improved production techniques had increased, or would increase, sales by 1987. Furthermore, the answers were to be focused only on markets relevant to CERN. For example, unless specifically affected, consumer goods divisions of CERN contractors were excluded from the survey. While the survey intent was straightforward, the range of questions was complex enough to minimize deliberate exaggeration by the contractors.

Once tabulated, the results were screened for irregular data before being extrapolated to the universe of 519 high-technology CERN contractors.<sup>5</sup> The raw data results suggested that each franc in CERN sales produced 4.2 francs in added sales. Especially in the electronics, optics, and computer industries, however, there were outliers: here the CERN franc produced 7.2 francs. The extrapolated results were tabulated by sector (see Table 1). As noted above, the net corrected benefit of each CERN franc to recipient firms was 3 francs.<sup>6</sup> This spillover is to the high-technology suppliers exclusively, since they were the focus of the CERN study.

The CERN Contracts Study staff performed an additional test to determine the overall accuracy of the managers' sales forecasts. The study included 40 firms that had participated in an earlier study that used the same method. Comparing the forecasts

<sup>4</sup> The CERN Contracts Study did not examine what may be the largest spinoff of pure research projects: the training of the next generation of scientists. Graduate students working on these projects are often unable to find academic jobs, and may therefore move into industry where much of their training may be useful. See Leon M. Lederman, "The Value of Fundamental Science," *Scientific American* (November 1984), pp. 40-47. However, this training would occur at any basic research site. In the case of the SSC, where the marginal dollar may very well come from other basic research, this effect may not result in any net benefit to the economy. In fairness to the CERN Contracts Study staff, they acknowledged that quantifying the secondary effects completely was impossible.

<sup>5</sup> Of CERN's 6,000 suppliers, the CERN Contracts Study classified 519 as "high technology," although the study did not define this term. The subsequent tabulations included steel and welding, which are not often classified as high technology.

<sup>6</sup> Among the other factors the CERN Contracts Study staff adjusted for was the effect of the CERN contracts prior to 1973. They assumed that non-CERN contracts won by CERN contractors during 1973-1975 resulted from previous CERN work and should not be counted in the 1973-1982 total. Such contracts turned out to be 15 percent of the total.

made by these firms' managers with the subsequent actual events indicated that, while individual forecasts were often wrong, the aggregate forecast was close to the actual aggregate. Tests suggested the differences between actual and forecasted sales were not statistically significant.

The CERN Contracts Study staff took this to mean that, on average, managers' forecasts would prove to be accurate.

TABLE 1.—CERN AND SPILLOVER SALES BY INDUSTRIAL CATEGORY

(In millions of 1977 Swiss francs)

	Electronics, optics, computers	Electrical equipment	Vacuum, cryogenics, superconductivity	Steel and welding	Precision mechanics	Total
Net new sales.....	2,245	1,025	400	255	155	4,080
CERN sales.....	537	472	152	104	111	1,376
Ratio of net new sales to CERN sales.....	4.7	2.2	2.6	2.4	1.4	3.0

<sup>1</sup> Average of ratios.

Note.—Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Source: CERN Contracts Study, p. 16.

#### Assumptions

The central, and perhaps flawed, assumption of the CERN Contracts Study is that 100 percent of the sales of CERN contractors are new sales to the economy; that is, these sales do not come at the cost of fewer sales going to firms that do not have CERN contracts. The CERN Contracts Study provides some supporting arguments for this 100 percent "additionality" assumption. It is nevertheless an assumption, and to the extent it is incorrect, CERN is merely rearranging sales rather than creating new sales. While such a rearrangement of sales is of great benefit to the firms doing the actual work, from a public policy perspective the question naturally arises of why a public agency, whether CERN or the U.S. Department of Energy, should spend money in order to shift sales to one favored group of firms. The following paragraphs discuss the CERN Contracts Study assumption and how it is contradicted throughout the study itself.

While the assumption of 100 percent additionality has some merit, it is given no statistical or anecdotal support in the study. It is a polar assumption in the sense that it is at the extreme end of the range of possibilities. At the other end of the range is the assumption that CERN contracts generate no additional sales in the aggregate and that the CERN contractors are merely diverting sales that would have gone to other firms.<sup>7</sup> This second polar assumption is the more conventional one, and thus the burden of proof lies with the CERN Contracts Study. CERN Contracts Study staff argue that their assumption holds for two reasons:<sup>8</sup>

The relevant markets are growth markets, so no firm is actually taking sales from other firms.

CERN buys only leading-edge products in these markets, and, by improving the qual-

<sup>7</sup> An even more extreme position would argue that if the government crowded out private investment in the credit markets, CERN research and development spending would reduce the funds available for private investment and so reduce aggregate contracts.

<sup>8</sup> CERN Contract Study, p. 5.



ity of its suppliers, forces the competitors to improve also.

The first argument ignores the concept of baseline rates of growth. If a market is growing independently of CERN sales, then firms in those markets should expect to see sales growth. Investors in these firms would normally regard the failure to grow as indicative that something was wrong with the firm's management, product mix, or marketing. While no European firm may lose sales to CERN contractors in an absolute sense, CERN contracts may very well depress sales growth of non-CERN contractor firms.

The second argument is simply overstated. Not every piece of equipment in CERN's laboratories leads the state of the art in its particular field. There will be certain components that are completely novel and other components that have substantial modifications and improvements. But to argue that CERN is simultaneously providing leadership in all aspects of the high technology it touches is to ignore the incremental and cumulative nature of scientific advance.<sup>9</sup> Like the first argument, this argument ignores improvements in technology that are occurring independently of CERN.

The assumption of 100 percent additionality is also regularly contradicted in the study. One of the major benefits the study claims for being a CERN contractor is that it can use CERN as a reference. The study cites one case where a firm used its CERN contracts, as the basis for admission to a trade association, "and, as a result, was able to obtain an increased number of [non-CERN] contracts."<sup>10</sup> The use of CERN as a reference for admission to a trade association, however, suggests a rearrangement rather than an expansion of sales. An expansion would come from the introduction of new products or from cost reduction.

In another example cited by CERN, a small firm that supplied CERN with "standard, but specialized, hydraulic equipment" became the industry standard, increasing sales and exports. While there may be some increase in sales due to the benefits of standardization—consumers benefit by not having to compare and choose among competing equipment standards—these are offset by sales lost by the purveyors of alternative standards.<sup>11</sup> In this case, therefore, there will be some net gain in aggregate sales, but there will also be some losses for other providers of standard, but specialized, hydraulic equipment, showing that sales are once again being redistributed.

In sum, CERN probably has, by pushing technology forward, increased aggregate sales in high-technology products. However, there is no supporting evidence offered for, and a substantial amount of evidence against, the assumption that all or any substantial portion of the new sales obtained by CERN contractors were not diverted from firms without CERN contracts.

<sup>9</sup> In the United States, many government programs involving high technology are not at the leading edge of their particular field. For instance, U.S. military systems lag commercial systems by two to seven years in integrated circuit usage, see Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, "Very High Speed Integrated Circuits, Annual Report for 1986" (VHSIC Program Office, December 31, 1986), p. 14.

<sup>10</sup> CERN Contracts Study, p. 11.

<sup>11</sup> These losses could be magnified if the "wrong" standard, that is, one that forecloses or distorts future technology development, is chosen. See Paul David, "Some New Standards for the Economics of Standardization in the Information Age" (Stanford, CA: Center for Economic Policy Research, October 1986), CEPR Publication No. 79.

#### Applicability to U.S. Circumstances

Is there reason to believe that the circumstances of the U.S. high-technology industries are substantially different from their European counterparts? Furthermore, are the circumstances of the SSC contracting substantially different from the circumstances of the CERN contracting? If the answer to both of these questions is yes, then CERN Contracts Study results may not be applicable to the SSC.

**High-Technology Industry.** In their justification of the additionality assumption, the CERN Contracts Study staff argued that it is "an efficient mechanism for keeping European industry abreast of international competition."<sup>12</sup> Simply put, the argument is that CERN contracts allow European suppliers to keep up with U.S. and Japanese suppliers of electronic goods and other high-technology products. The U.S. industry is in a very different position. While U.S. high-technology industries have lost part of their competitiveness to Japan's and other countries' high-technology industries, these losses have occurred to a large extent among products of lower technical sophistication, such as consumer products.

The microcomputer market is a case in point. (The emphasis is on the electronic and computer goods industries because over half of the added sales measured by CERN Contracts Study staff occurred in electronics, optics, and computers. See Table 1.) Imports to the United States from Korea and other newly industrialized Asian countries consist mainly of less sophisticated IBM-compatible personal computers. IBM, Compaq, Apple, SUN, and other U.S. companies still control the more technologically advanced segment of that market. Since scientists and technicians working on particle accelerator physics need the best equipment available, in the field of microcomputer technology they will be pushing for advances in the segment of the market the United States already dominates. Of course, not all markets divide as neatly as the microcomputer market: Japan, for instance, has made substantial inroads into leading-edge semiconductor and semiconductor manufacturing equipment markets.

One of the benefits of CERN contracts mentioned in the study is that they help small firms to export to other European Community nations. The barriers to interstate commerce in the United States are nowhere near as high as they are in Europe. U.S. industries share legal traditions and systems, language, professional and trade journals and magazines, and trade associations. Given his lack of internal barriers, small firms in the United States should need little help to ship elsewhere in the United States.

**Procurement.** Procurement of high-technology components for the SSC in the United States may differ from that for CERN in two major ways. First, it is quite possible that some of the main components, such as the magnets or the detectors, may be built and donated by foreign contributors. If so, the economy of the nation actually building those components will benefit, not necessarily the U.S. industry. In this regard the Congress faces a dilemma. If it pays for the whole projects, the costs may be prohibitive. On the other hand, the major international interest in contributing financially has been expressed in precisely those areas, the superconducting magnets

and the detectors, where spinoffs for contractors, whether through new products or reduced costs, are most likely.

The second way in which procurement for the SSC may differ from CERN procurement is that the market for superconductors is about to change dramatically. The development of high-temperature superconductors may make the market for superconductors much larger. At the same time, it may change many of the skills needed in handling superconductors. For instance, it is much less difficult to work with liquid nitrogen than with liquid helium. Consequently, much of the expertise required for current superconductors may become superfluous. It is too early to tell whether market presence in the low-temperature superconductor market will be of benefit in the emerging high-temperature superconductor market. For instance, none of the major vacuum tube makers successfully made an early transition into semiconductor manufacturing, despite the similarity of uses. Since \$1.2 billion (in fiscal year 1986 dollars) allocated to the SSC is being spent on the superconducting magnets and associated infrastructure, a substantial portion of the high-technology components of the SSC may quickly become commercially obsolete and hence produce very few spinoffs.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, they may not. In rapidly changing circumstances, it is inappropriate to extrapolate from studies made under conditions of more stable evolution.

#### SOURCES OF FUNDING IN THE UNITED STATES

The process of selecting the site for the SSC in the United States is currently well underway. After examining submissions by many states regarding their geological, infrastructure, and educational resources, the National Academy of Sciences site selection panel chose eight finalist states.<sup>14</sup> After one state, New York, withdrew its application, seven were left: Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. The Department of Energy (DOE) is conducting further studies, including a study of environmental impact, to determine which state provides the best combination of qualities for the SSC site. Later this year the Secretary of Energy is expected to recommend a single state to the President.

The Administration currently projects that the SSC will cost \$5.3 billion to build. The desire to reduce the federal costs of the SSC has raised questions regarding possible financial contributions from the state government for the construction of the SSC, although the Congress directed the DOE to ignore possible state financial contributions to the construction of the SSC in its selection process. The following discussion outlines the costs of contributing to the construction of the SSC and the limits on states' capacities to contribute. Alternative measures of state revenue-raising capacity are then discussed. Ultimately, however, the funding decision is political, not technical: do the people and government of the designated state want to spend their limited resources on the SSC?

#### The Cost of Debt

The states could incur substantial costs in helping to pay for the SSC, depending on the amounts contributed. As with other cap-

<sup>13</sup> SSC Central Design Group, "Conceptual Design of the Superconducting Super Collider" (September 1986), p. 697.

<sup>14</sup> National Academy of Sciences, "Siting the Superconducting Super Collider" (Washington, D.C., 1988), p. 1.

<sup>12</sup> CERN Contract Study, p. 5.

ital expenses, a designated state is likely to pay for its contribution with long-term debt as a means of spreading the cost of its contribution over a long period. This section discusses the cost to the states of issuing \$1 billion in debt.

A \$1 billion bond issue to pay for the SSC would cost a state between \$105 million and \$109 million per year in debt service. This analysis assumes that SSC bonds will be amortized over 20 years. The interest rate will be between 0.5 and 1.0 percentage points below the Congressional Budget Office's (CBO) 1989 forecast of 9.5 percent for the 10-year U.S. Government note.<sup>15</sup> The final list states have good credit ratings, and it would serve little purpose to attempt to differentiate the interest rates each might have to pay on a hypothetical bond.

The annual cost per capita of SSC bonds would vary between a low of \$6.50 in Texas and a high of \$33 in Arizona, because of Texas' larger population. This would represent 0.05 and 0.27 percent, respectively, of before-tax personal income in those states. (See Table 2 for a listing of all the states.)

State general obligation bonds and most state revenue bonds are exempt from federal taxes. Consequently, when states issue bonds the federal government forgoes some income. In the case of bonds to pay for the SSC, the assumption must be made either that SSC bonds would increase the aggregate number of bonds the state in question is issuing, or that they would merely substitute for other functions the state might perform. If a state decides not to increase its indebtedness, but rather decides to reduce other services in order to contribute to the SSC, then the State's contribution may not cause any new revenue losses for the federal government. On the other hand, if the state decides to expand its services to include the SSC and must increase its debt and taxes to do this, then there is the potential of increasing federal revenue losses.<sup>16</sup> A state could also finance its contribution through a mixture of some new indebtedness and some reduction of other projected debt. It is impossible to know how states will act in this regard. Consequently, the results of any revenue loss calculations should be considered as upper bounds and not necessarily the most likely occurrence.

<sup>15</sup> Congressional Budget Office, "The Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal Years 1989-1993" (February 1988), p. 41. For purposes of simplicity, this analysis does not include the effects of call and other such provisions on the valuation of the bonds. This analysis also assumes there are no costs attached to floating the bond, other than the interest and principal payments. Because state public purpose bonds have been exempt from federal taxes, state general obligation bonds have offered an interest rate that averaged 1.7 percentage points below the 10-year Treasury bill rate during the 1980s. Since tax reform, the difference has decreased: it was 0.7 percentage points in 1987.

<sup>16</sup> For the sake of computational simplicity, this argument ignores the effect SSC bonds might have on the interest rates of other tax-exempt state and local bonds. SSC bonds would represent only a small fraction of total state issues. In 1986, for instance, states and local governments issued \$142 billion worth of tax-exempt bonds, see "The Bond Buyer, 1987 Yearbook" (American Banker-Bond Buyer 1987), p. 11.

TABLE 2.—COST OF \$1 BILLION OF SSC BONDS

State	Annual cost per capita (in dollars)		Share of personal income (in percent)	
	At 8.5 percent	At 9.0 percent	At 8.5 percent	At 9.0 percent
Arizona	31.61	32.77	0.26	0.27
Colorado	32.09	33.77	.22	.23
Illinois	9.07	9.41	.06	.06
Michigan	11.46	11.88	.08	.09
North Carolina	16.56	17.17	.14	.15
Tennessee	21.83	22.63	.20	.20
Texas	6.28	6.52	.05	.05

Note.—Cost assumes \$1.0 billion amortized over 20 years at 8.5 percent and 9.0 percent rates of interest, with semiannual interest payments.  
Source: Congressional Budget Office, calculated from Bureau of the Census, "State Government Finances in 1986" (October 1987), p. 56.

Over the life of the bonds, the states would pay between \$1.1 billion and \$1.2 billion in interest income. Assuming the investors are in the 28 percent tax bracket, the federal government could forgo as much as \$307 million to \$328 million in tax revenues in order to receive a \$1 billion contribution from the state. The present value of these losses would vary with the discount rate.<sup>17</sup> At a 5 percent discount, the present value would range between \$210 million and \$230 million. At a 10 percent discount, the present value would range between \$160 million and \$170 million.

#### State Constitutional Limitations on State Borrowing

Each state's constitution defines how much general obligation (GO) debt (backed by the full faith and credit of the state) the state government can incur and under what conditions.<sup>18</sup> These terms vary widely among states. The principal types of limitations include limits on amounts, requiring referendums or extraordinary majorities in the state legislatures (usually 60 or 66 percent) if the limit is to be exceeded. Consequently, in most states, issuing GO debt is time-consuming and difficult.

In response to these limitations to GO debt, state agencies have devised alternative debt instruments, which do not technically encumber the state credit yet provide lenders with access to a relatively secure stream of funds from state activities. These alternative instruments have much less stringent authorization requirements. In many cases, a simple majority in the state legislature (coupled occasionally with approval by a state treasurer or bond board) will suffice for authorization. Often, these alternative debt instruments come in the form of revenue bonds or certificates of participation in lease purchase agreements and are used to pay for a wide variety of capital construction projects. For example, in one instance a state issued certificates of participation to build a prison. The state would lease the prison and, through the lease payments, repay the debt. While technically not an encumbrance to the state income (if the state did not need the prison, it was only held by the terms of the lease), the state was not

<sup>17</sup> While the Congressional Budget Office forecasts a 9.5 percent interest rate for the 1989 10-year federal government bond, these high interest rates may hold for the entire 20 years of losses. Therefore, this analysis uses a range of discount rates reflecting both CBO and Administration forecasted interest rates over the next few years.

<sup>18</sup> This discussion is largely taken from the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Significant Features of Fiscal Federalism, 1988 Edition, Volume 1* (December 1987), pp. 102-103.

likely to end the lease.<sup>19</sup> Similarly, revenue bonds are usually paid for by the stream of revenue coming from a project, not directly through state coffers.

As can be seen from Table 3, these alternative debt instruments have come to represent the majority of state debt. The highest level of GO debt (as a percentage of all debt) is in Tennessee, at 40 percent. Other states have lower figures, and two states cannot issue long-term GO debt at all.

CBO has found two finalist states that are currently authorized to issue debt for the SSC. The Texas state government is authorized to issue \$500 million in GO debt and \$500 million in revenue bonds should Texas be selected as the site. The State of Illinois is authorized to issue \$180 million in GO debt.<sup>20</sup> These two states, however, may not be unique in their willingness to incur debt for the SSC: other states may merely be paying for SSC-related improvements, such as access roads, water and the like, through their highway and water works bond issues.

#### Measures of Revenue-Raising Capacity

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) developed two types of measures of states' fiscal capacity in a recent report (referred to as ACIR Fiscal Capacity Report).<sup>21</sup> The first type measures the taxpayers' ability to pay taxes and other levies; the second measures the state governments' ability to collect revenues. The first approach depends on macroeconomic variables, such as state personal income, while the second looks at statutory tax or revenue bases, such as retail sales. This discussion concentrates on the second approach.

TABLE 3.—STATE GOVERNMENT LONG-TERM INDEBTEDNESS, FISCAL YEAR 1986

	Total	Type (In millions of dollars)		Per capita (in dollars)	Percentage of personal income
		General obligation	Other		
Arizona.....	1,472	0	1,472	444	3.6
Colorado.....	1,998	0	1,998	612	4.2
Illinois.....	11,979	3,758	8,221	1,037	7.0
Michigan.....	7,050	622	6,428	771	5.7
North Carolina.....	2,593	768	1,826	410	3.6
Tennessee.....	1,978	753	1,225	412	3.7
Texas.....	5,432	1,970	3,462	326	2.5

Note.—Details may not add to totals because of rounding.  
Source: Bureau of the Census, "State Government Finances in 1986," (October 1987), pp. 34 and 56.

The central capacity concepts used in this section are the Representative Tax System (RTS) and the closely-related Representative Revenue System (RRS). These measures start with the commonly used statutory tax and revenue bases (such as retail sales), and weight these by national average tax rates. Included in the RTS are general sales taxes, selective sales taxes, licenses,

<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, most states have balanced budget requirements. Shifting from capital accounts to ordinary spending accounts could run into other limits.

<sup>20</sup> In late February, Governor Thompson proposed \$539.3 million in bond funds for the SSC and the legislature could increase the authorization.

<sup>21</sup> This section is largely derived from the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Measuring States Fiscal Capacity, 1987 Edition* (December 1987). The purpose of examining these measures is not to bias the site selection process, but rather to examine the general fiscal capacities of the states and the indicators used to measure them.



personal income taxes, corporate net income taxes, and property taxes. The RRS adds to the RTS by also including nontax revenue sources, most notably user charges.<sup>22</sup>

These are conventional measures, representing national averages. Individual states, because of their political histories and citizens' preferences, may have tax rates far above or below the average or "representative" rates used by ACIR.<sup>23</sup> While this analysis may refer to one or another state as being above or below the average or representative tax rate, this does not imply a judgment about the desirability of movement toward the average. Because the RTS and RRS are derived from statutory bases they will not capture all the potential sources of state revenue and income. However, it is unlikely that financing for the SSC will be a motivating factor for major breakthroughs in state financing. On the other hand, states with current high levels of taxation may be perceived as worse risks by bond rating agencies if they have to take on substantially more debt for the SSC.

ACIR has collected and published estimates only until 1985. Many changes have occurred since then to make these already crude measures even more suspect. For instance, the Congress has enacted tax reform and the states have responded by changing their tax systems. In many cases, the states were attempting to capture the windfall provided to states by tax reform. Other states returned this surplus to taxpayers. These changes may alter rankings for different revenue-raising efforts. On the other hand, despite the dramatic drop in oil prices in early 1986, personal income in Texas has not declined substantially since the data for the ACIR numbers was collected.<sup>24</sup> Texas raised and expanded its general sales tax after 1985 in response to a state deficit.

TABLE 4.—COMPARISON OF STATE FISCAL CAPACITY, FISCAL YEAR 1985

State	Fiscal effort (national average = 1)	
	RTS	RRS
Arizona	0.96	0.95
Colorado	.85	.88
Illinois	1.06	.97
Michigan	1.20	1.17
North Carolina	.93	.92
Tennessee	.82	.89
Texas	.76	.81

Note.—RTS=Representative Tax System; RRS=Representative Revenue System.

Source: Congressional Budget Office, calculated from Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), *Measuring State Fiscal Capacity*, 1987 Edition (December 1987).

As can be seen from Table 4, states vary in their per capita revenue-raising efforts. Michigan has the highest level of effort of any of the finalist states: in both the RTS and RRS, the state revenues are above the state's "capacity," where capacity is defined using "representative" tax rates. By contrast, Texas has the lowest tax effort measured by either the RTS or the RRS. (Texas is the only finalist state without a personal

income tax, accounting for its lesser revenue-raising effort.)

#### INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS IN HIGH-ENERGY PHYSICS

Both opponents and proponents of the SSC agree that the federal government should seek international funding to spread the cost of the SSC over as many science budgets as possible. The paragraphs below discuss the current high-energy physics budgets of potential contributors and outline their current science budgets.

##### Japan

According to the U.S. Department of Energy, in fiscal year 1984, Japan had a high-energy physics budget of roughly \$150 million per year. Since then, while the value (in dollar terms) has risen, the effort (in physicists) has remained relatively constant. By comparison, the total research and development budget of the Japanese Government for fiscal year 1984 was \$6.2 billion.<sup>25</sup> Between fiscal years 1984 and 1987 (ending in March 1988), that budget increased (in yen) by 14.2 percent.

##### The European Community

According to the U.S. Department of Energy, the European Community as a whole had a high-energy physics budget of \$660 million dollars in fiscal year 1984.<sup>26</sup> CERN accounted for \$340 million, or roughly half of this. CERN members are currently committed to a rival of the SSC—the Large Hadron Collider—which they feel is cost efficient when compared to the SSC.<sup>27</sup> Most notably, Italy, which is often mentioned as a potential source of funding, is already participating in three high-energy physics programs—CERN, DESY in West Germany, and its own Gran Sasso National Laboratory. Since the current five-year planning cycle in Italy is already well underway, if not completed, it is unclear how much of Italy's current budget remains uncommitted. The total Italian science budget was \$1.2 billion in fiscal year 1986.

##### Soviet Union

According to the U.S. Department of Energy, the Soviet Union has committed as many resources in terms of people and equipment as the United States has to the development of high-energy physics. However, it is unclear what the budget is in terms of money.

##### Canada

There are currently less than 100 high-energy physicists in Canada. Although the Canadian government participates in the projects at CERN, DESY, Fermilab, and Brookhaven, among others, it has few facilities of its own. It also spends little on high-energy physics: estimates range between \$10 million and \$50 million per year. (The variation in the estimates is largely a function of whether medium-energy physics and low-energy physics, which include Van De Graaf generators, are counted in particle physics.) The Canadian government is currently con-

templating one major particle accelerator—TRIUMF—which is projected to cost \$500 million to upgrade and which it may ask the United States to participate in. The Canadian contribution to HERA, a hadron collider at DESY, is reported to have been less than \$20 million.<sup>28</sup>

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1988]

#### YES, BIG SCIENCE. BUT WHICH PROJECTS?

To govern is to choose, and when it comes to spending big bucks on science, the Reagan Administration is doing neither.

Big science projects dominate the President's substantial research requests: a vastly expensive space station . . . a 53-mile ring in which to smash atomic particles . . . an amazing map of human genes. These and other increases in science spending amount to \$3 billion for next year alone. Yet much of the money would go to poorly analyzed ventures whose growth threatens more fruitful initiatives. Which ones deserve support?

The Administration offers no criteria. Scientists habitually avoid criticizing each other's programs lest Congress react by cutting research budgets. But the imminent prospect that big projects will squeeze out smaller ones has prompted an unusual call from Frank Press, president of the National Academy of Sciences. He has invited his colleagues to an unusual exercise in setting priorities from among the projects on the Reagan laundry list.

Space Station and Space Science. The President wants \$739 million to continue design of NASA's palatial space station. Its likely eventual cost has already soared to \$26 billion. As its spending wedge grows, the space station is bound to crush other, valuable space science programs in NASA's budget, just as the shuttle did before it. The space station's main commercial use would be to provide low gravity for research and manufacture. That can be offered sooner and far more cheaply by the proposed Industrial Space Facility.

Supercollider and Superconductivity. Mr. Reagan would lay out \$363 million to start the \$4.4 billion superconducting supercollider. This is a tempting but dangerous initiative because funds to pay for it almost certainly would be stripped from other physics research. Physicists are divided on the project's merits.

The collider is designed to explore a new energy range in search of the ultimate constituents of matter, particularly a predicted entity known as the Higgs boson. The field is of high intellectual interest, and it would be a sad day if the United States did not remain a major player.

But European physicists have shown how an existing collider ring at Geneva could be upgraded to within probable reach of the Higgs boson. Buying into the European ring would be cheaper. By the time the present U.S. deficits disappear, the new materials may allow a new American accelerator to be built more cheaply.

Human Genes and Human Hunger. The President proposes to spend \$46 million in determining the chemical sequence of the human genetic instruction set. The National Academy of Sciences advocates a crash program, costing \$3 billion, but insists that

<sup>22</sup> The value of the yen was calculated to be 234.4 to the U.S. dollar in fiscal year 1984 and 248 in 1985. This estimate excludes local and semi-governmental agency expenses. Including these would increase the total by roughly 25 percent. See "Japan Economic Institute Report" (August 1, 1986 and November 13, 1987).

<sup>23</sup> This analysis assumes 2.256 Swiss francs to the U.S. dollar in fiscal year 1984.

<sup>24</sup> Herwig Schopper, the head of CERN, testified before the Congress last year, "The hadron collider in the LEP [large electron-positron] tunnel would cover the interesting energy range at a fraction of the projected cost of the SSC."

<sup>25</sup> HERA construction costs were originally estimated to be \$400 million in 1984 dollars. More recent reports suggest much higher costs. William Boesman, "World Inventory of 'Big Science' Research Instruments and Facilities" (Congressional Research Service, 1986), p. 68.

<sup>26</sup> ACIR Fiscal Capacity Report, p. 113.

<sup>27</sup> For an early discussion of local preferences for taxes and government services, see Charles M. Tiebout, "A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures," *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 64 (October 1956).

<sup>28</sup> Personal income by state for 1987 is not yet available. In 1985, Texans had a before-tax personal income of \$221 million. This rose to \$225 million in 1986.

paying for the project "must not be at the expense of currently funded biological research." Opponents may wonder why AIDS research, for instance, should take the hit on behalf of a project for which biologists say they won't sacrifice a cent.

Even so, the first step taken toward sequencing the human genome ranks as by far the most promising of Mr. Reagan's big science schemes. The project offers knowledge about the biological basis of existence, and a bounty of medical applications. Though researchers in time would pick out the most interesting parts of the gene set, an organized program to sequence all of it would speed the process of discovery.

Science now amounts to 16 percent of domestic non-entitlement outlays. Given Congress's pent-up desires for other spending, Mr. Reagan has no hope of getting all his desires funded. In the absence of any coherent Federal policy for science, there are few guideposts for picking through the wish list. Because he has failed to set priorities, Congress will have to try its best to do so.

[From Business Week, Mar. 28, 1988]

#### WHY EVEN REAGAN'S MEGAPROJECTS AREN'T GETTING MEGABUCKS

(By Evert Clark)

When the current National Science Foundation budget came up for final consideration last December, it met with stiff competition. Along with a \$30 billion space station, it also vied with a parking garage at Arlington National Cemetery, a trust fund for leaking underground storage tanks, and housing for the elderly and handicapped. The NSF, which supports most U.S. academic science, didn't fare very well. Congress increased the agency's budget by only 5.5%, well below the 17% President Reagan pledged as part of his push for technological competitiveness.

In the past the agency's budgets usually slid through Congress unscathed. But now science funding is taking a beating on Capitol Hill, and critics in and out of the Administration are pointing their fingers at the President. Fearing that the U.S. may lose its lead in such fields as space, aviation, and high-energy physics research, the Reagan Administration has endorsed a dazzling array of high-priced projects. But federal budgets are so tight that the megaprojects "are now in civil war with each other," says a congressional staffer.

The NSF budget was hardly the only one to feel the pinch. Funding for a hypersonic aircraft the President had hailed as the key to U.S. dominance of world aeronautics was cut by 21%, and money for the manned space station was slashed by 40%.

Such drastic cutbacks can weaken programs so badly that Congress eventually decides to put them out of their misery. "It was sheer lunacy," says an Office of Management & Budget analyst. "I can't imagine that a modern country of our size is supposed to run this way." And the 1989 budget promises to be worse. Representative Edward P. Boland (D-Mass.), chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee on housing, warned Reagan on Mar. 10 that unless he shifted more money to housing programs, he could "kiss good-bye to the space station."

#### BREAKING DOWN

The problem, say scientists and legislators alike, is that no one is setting priorities for increasingly costly science and technology projects. Scientists are asking for too much, and the President and congressional science

committees are trying to give it to them. But no one is making tough choices, says one frustrated Administration official. "It's a crazy, patchwork kind of way to make science policy," he declares. Adds the manager of a high-priority Pentagon program that is losing funds despite Reagan's strong backing: "I think our system is breaking down—it's just chaotic."

It wasn't always that way. In the years following World War II, scientists forged a strong alliance with Washington. Responding to the shock of the Soviet Sputnik satellite in 1957, President Eisenhower elevated an advisory committee that he called "my scientists" to White House status and named the first Presidential science adviser. That tradition continued through the Kennedy years but began to flag under President Johnson. And when some science advisers openly opposed President Nixon's antiballistic missile system as well as the Vietnam War, he retaliated by abolishing the White House science office.

In 1976, Congress ordered the White House to reestablish a science adviser, Presidents Ford and Carter each hired one but did not form advisory committees. Reagan had two but left the science post open for long periods during his terms in office, and critics say, listened only to scientists who agreed with him. Reagan's first science adviser, George A. Keyworth II, confirms that: Scientists who did not share Reagan's vision of projects such as the Strategic Defense Initiative program had a "diminished role and credibility in the formulation of national policy."

Few are more concerned about the lack of direction in U.S. science policy than former Presidential science advisers and technology leaders. In a just-published book of essays that they hope current Presidential candidates will heed, Science & Technology Advice to the President, Congress, and Judiciary, almost all of the former Presidential advisers make a case for having a strong, nonpolitical committee of scientists to advise the President. The lack of such a group allowed science policy to sink "into a real morass," says the editor of the book, 78-year-old head of the New York Academy of Sciences, William T. Golden, whose report to President Truman in 1950 led to the creation of the first science advisory committee.

Indeed, some former Presidential advisers argue that if Reagan had listened to a panel of independent voices he might never have launched some of his most controversial projects. Many scientists were skeptical of the \$27 billion Star Wars missile shield. Others said that the proposed \$6 billion atom smasher known as the Superconducting Super Collider is a costly toy for a handful of high-energy physicists. Some experts also believe that Presidential advisers would have watched the space program closely so the Challenger shuttle disaster might have been avoided.

#### FIRST CASUALTY?

President Reagan, however, is still showing no signs of restraint. Despite his agreement to an overall 2% increase for discretionary domestic spending, he wants to double the space station's budget to \$1 billion and increase funding for the SSC from \$25 million to \$363 million.

The SSC, which former House Science & Technology Committee Chairman Don Fuqua (D-Fla.) called an example of "driving beyond our headlights," typifies the cross-pressures of science funding. The Energy Dept., seven states, more than 70

large companies, and the heads of 49 university physics departments are lobbying to keep the project alive. But veterans of the budget wars already are predicting it will be the first casualty when the bloodletting begins this year.

Such lobbying efforts on big-ticket projects have put the once lofty science community in the same league as other special pleaders seeking legislative pork. And its projects are starting to face similar scrutiny on Capitol Hill. Unless the scientists and policymakers can come up with a coherent, affordable science policy, the nation's technological leadership could be in further jeopardy.

[From New Technology Week, May 16, 1988]

#### QUESTIONING THE SPINOFFS OF THE SSC

Supporters' claims that there will be a wide variety of spinoffs from the building of the Superconducting Super Collider may be off base, warns the Congressional Budget Office. Research results from the \$5.3 billion project "are not expected to pay for themselves economically for decades, if ever," says the CBO. "While early economic use of these results would be welcome, [the SSC is] being undertaken purely for knowledge and any other use of the results should be considered fortuitous."

Moreover, direct economic spinoffs (construction jobs, for instance) from the money spent on constructing the SSC "would be roughly the same whether the government were building a highway or a particle accelerator."

In terms of the economic benefits to the suppliers of high-technology components for the accelerator, CBO analyzes the often-quoted CERN Contracts Study of 1984, which shows that every franc in CERN sales to contractors generated 4.2 francs in added (outside) sales. In the electronics, optics and computer industries, each franc generated 7.2 francs in sales, CERN found in its study.

CBO takes a cautious approach to these findings. CBO finds that CERN "probably has, by pushing technology forward, increased aggregate sales in high-technology products." But the study could just as easily point out that "CERN is merely rearranging sales rather than creating new sales. While such a rearrangement of sales is of great benefit to the firms doing the actual work, from a public policy perspective the question naturally arises of why a public agency, whether CERN or the U.S. Department of Energy, should spend money in order to shift sales to one favored group of firms."

The argument that the procurement of high tech goods will keep U.S. industry competitive is also questionable, CBO writes. Using the microcomputer market as an example, CBO says that the U.S. already controls the most technologically advanced segment of this industry. "Since scientists and technicians working on particle accelerator physics need the best equipment available, in the field of microcomputer technology, they will be pushing for advances in the segment of the market the United States already dominates."

Procuring equipment for the SSC will be vastly different from CERN, CBO writes. "It is quite possible that some of the main components such as the magnets or the detectors may be built and donated by foreign contributors. If so, the economy of the nation actually building those components will benefit, not necessarily the U.S. industry. In this regard the Congress faces a di-



lemma. If [the government] pays for the whole project, he cost may be prohibitive. On the other hand, the major international interest in contributing financially has been expressed in precisely those areas, the superconducting magnets and detectors, where spinoffs for contractors, whether through new products or reduced costs, are most likely."

CBO also questions whether, as a result of the breakthroughs in high-temperature superconductivity, the superconducting industry will change dramatically. "It is too early to tell whether market presence in the low-temperature superconductor market will be of benefit in the emerging high-temperature superconductor market," CBO writes. "For instance, none of the major vacuum tube makers successfully made an early transition into semiconductor manufacturing, despite the similarity of uses. Since the \$1.2 billion (in fiscal year 1986 dollars) allocated to the SSC is being spent on the superconducting magnets and associated infrastructure, a substantial portion of the high-technology components of the SSC may quickly become commercially obsolete and hence produce very few spinoffs. On the other hand, they may not."

In its report, CBO also questions the states' abilities to help provide financing for the SSC, much of which would come from issuing bonds. "A \$1 billion bond to pay for the SSC would cost a state between \$105 million and \$109 million per year in debt service," CBO points out. Since many state issued bonds are exempt from federal taxes, the federal government will "forego" revenues. "In the case of bonds to pay for the SSC, the assumption must be made either that SSC bonds would increase the aggregate number of bonds the state in question is issuing, or that they would merely substitute for other functions the state might perform. If a state decides not to increase its indebtedness, but rather decides to reduce other services in order to contribute to the SSC, then the state's contribution may not cause any new revenue losses for the federal government. On the other hand, if the state decides to expand its services to include the SSC and must increase its debt and taxes to do this, then there is the potential of increasing federal revenue losses. . . . The federal government could forego as much as \$307 million to \$328 million in tax revenues in order to receive a \$1 billion contribution from the [winning] state."

[From Physics Today, February 1988]

#### ALTERNATIVES TO THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

(By Freeman Dyson)

The debate over the Superconducting Super Collider has given the public a false impression that people who oppose the SSC are opposed to particle physics in general. I happen to be a supporter of particle physics and an opponent of the SSC. Let me briefly explain why.

Continued progress in particle physics requires a succession of new machines responsive to rapidly changing theories and rapidly changing technologies. Nobody is wise enough to guess what will be the important questions and the important tools ten years ahead. Every new machine is a gamble. If we build the SSC, it might turn out to be a glorious success or it might turn out to be a flop. In either case, we will want to build other machines to carry on from where the SSC stops. Unfortunately, the SSC is an end rather than a beginning. It does not offer much hope of further development. It does

not incorporate a new idea I am afraid that it may be a trap, tying our particle physicists to an old technology and barring the way to newer and more powerful alternatives.

What are the alternatives? I do not claim to be an expert on accelerator design, but I see a tremendous promise in linear electron-positron colliders. There are many reasons why linear electron-positron colliders may be a better gamble than the SSC.

Electron-positron collisions are usually cleaner and scientifically more illuminating than hadron collisions. Our existing electron-positron colliders SPEAR and CESR have been outstandingly cost-effective, as measured by major scientific discoveries per dollar invested. In the TeV range, the advantage of easier diagnostics is likely to favor electron-positron colliders even more strongly.

In electron-positron colliders the full machine energy is available in elementary interactions, whereas in the SSC the energy is shared among quarks and only a fraction of the machine energy is available.

The technology of future accelerators must move toward high luminosity as well as high energy. High luminosity demands tiny interaction volumes and extreme accuracy of focus and timing. All these requirements are pushing us in the direction of optical laser fields rather than radiofrequency fields for acceleration.

The substitution of laser for radiofrequency fields could in principle allow a drastic reduction in the length of linear accelerators. To take a rough example, a joule of laser energy in a 3-nanosecond pulse focused into a 10-micron spot produces an accelerating field of 50 GeV per meter. Nobody knows yet how to use such fields efficiently for acceleration. But we might reasonably gamble some fraction of our efforts on the chance that we can learn how to build an electron-positron collider with linear accelerators giving us 10 TeV per kilometer.

The technology of free-electron lasers is advancing rapidly and is giving us experience in handling interactions between intense electron and laser beams. A laser-driven electron-positron collider is in essence only a free-electron laser working backwards. The problems of beam instability are similar whether we are trying to push energy from electrons into photons or from photons into electrons.

If laser acceleration works well in the domain of linear electron-positron colliders, there is no reason why it should not also be applied to hadron colliders. We might then be able to build a linear hadron collider with the performance of the SSC, but much smaller and cheaper.

The great virtue of electron-positron collider technology is that it can be pursued incrementally. Our aim should be to build cost-effective machines with high luminosity at a variety of energies, able to respond quickly to the various opportunities that new discoveries will create.

All these arguments in favor of linear electron-positron colliders may turn out to be wrong. Likewise, the arguments in favor of the SSC may turn out to be wrong. A prudent gambler places his bets so that no matter what happens, he stays in business. If a decision to build the SSC means that we give up the aggressive pursuit of laser acceleration and other innovative technologies, then the SSC may become as great a setback for particle physics as the space shuttle has been for space science. A vote against the SSC need not be a vote against particle physics.

I am grateful to the editors of Physics Today for an advance copy of the article "New Particle Acceleration Techniques" by Andrew Sessler (January, page 26). Sessler does not agree with me. His article is an authoritative survey of linear electron-positron collider technology. Anybody with a serious interest in alternatives to the SSC should read it.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in opposition to this amendment. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to likewise oppose this amendment. I think we have to really look at where we are. Mr. Chairman, we are the stewards of this Nation's energy research and technology programs. We are stewards of big science and little science. We have to look at our basic science programs and look at big projects such as the superconducting super collider and put it all in perspective.

Mr. Chairman, I think this committee has done a worthy job of doing that. The administration requested \$363 million for the SSC. The committee brought the funding recommendation down to \$138 million which is \$38 million over the House-approved appropriations level. What we are talking about is an investment in this Nation's scientific future. The real flaw of this amendment is that by limiting it to \$100 million it does not provide for the essential technology systems development and non-site-specific construction activities that are crucial to the beginning site-specific construction activities in 1990. We do need the technical systems development activities that are related to construction, that is, that are not site specific. Also, multiyear funding is required to establish a basis for foreign participation. If we are serious about our industrial participation, we are going to need the commitment not only to let other countries know but to let the private sector know that we are serious about the SSC. We did defeat this amendment in full committee. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment. It is not sound. This is essentially a delaying tactic that will lead to unacceptable project delays and will delay construction.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support the level adopted by the committee.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, would join the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD] in urging defeat of this amendment. Let us make very clear that the amendment was considered in full committee. Let us make clear that the chairman of the committee opposes this amendment. Let us make it very clear and understood that the Republican vice chairman of the full committee opposes the amendment. Let us

make it very clear that when it was presented before the full committee it was rejected by the committee and I can only wish that my good friend from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER] had actually been a little more attentive to some of our discussion in the general debate and also in the general debate and passage of the NASA bill yesterday because one of the points that was made over and over again was the breakthrough that we have achieved in the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology this year that for the first time in many years we have managed to secure multiyear funding for a number of major important scientific and technology and space projects that are critical to this Nation and which are facilitated by making some long-range and stable commitments.

Would the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER], for example, have been pleased if I suggested we retreat to single-year funding in the NASA budget? I do not think he would.

Would the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER] have supported it if I had gotten up and said no, the SCRAM jet and advanced avionics in the legislation we dealt with yesterday ought to go on this year-to-year, fits-and-starts basis over again with the problem inherent in terms of increasing costs rather than saving in costs? I do not think he would have supported that approach.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we are going to enter this kind of debate it ought to be addressed to the entire plethora of issues that have come before the committee rather than singling one out.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER].

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY] has said if I had paid a little more attention to the general debate, and he used examples about would I have supported a cut in outyear funding on the space station, for example.

I think we made a commitment and the commitment has been continuing on the space station. We are in direct competition with the Soviet Union. There are innumerable numbers of scientists that have said we should be in space and there are direct spinoffs from that.

□ 1030

I would just ask the gentleman to tell me one specific spinoff that he is aware of that the SSC, if it is built, will contribute other than providing employment for people in the selected site.

Mr. HENRY. I am pleased the gentleman raised the question. The fact is at the point in time when we began

the space program in the 1950's and 1960's, we did not know what the spinoffs were going to be either. At that point space represented a kind of investment in hard science without knowing the practical utilitarian applied impacts it was going to have, not only in terms of our national self-interest but in terms of the economic growth that was going to be affected by that. The whole nature of this project, of course, is such that we cannot predict with certitude what the spinoffs are, but I am sure the gentleman would not contest the fact that what is at issue here with the SSC is not whether or not an SSC is going to be built. The only question is when it is going to be built and where it is going to be built. If the gentleman wants to get up here and suggest that we ought to yield the supremacy that this Nation enjoys in high-energy physics to the European Community or to the Pacific Rim nations, he ought to get up and say that. But this is not in our national interest because of the fact that it represents base science in an area in which we enjoy supremacy.

Let me just continue here. We are just at this point finishing a draft report of the Science and Technology Task Force established by this committee. I am sure the gentleman from Missouri knows we are circulating this, and those of us who have been on the task force are making comments and sending them back to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACKAY], and one of the premier recommendations of that task force report is that we need a long-term multiyear commitment in basic-science projects. That happens to be one of the premier recommendations of the work of the committee, of this task force, which has been going on for 4 years. It seems to me highly inconsistent in two ways: One, to single out one project in a way in which other multiyear projects are not being treated and, second, it flies in the face of our own task force recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, this is a good bill. The superconductor super collider is one issue that I happen to agree, however, that ought to be removed and I support the Buechner amendment. I do so with some trepidation because, after listening to the gentleman from Michigan, I almost feel like a member of the Flat Earth Society opposing something that might have long-term scientific and technological consequences for the United States.

The ultimate issue is we have got to make priorities. We have got to make judgments, because there are a lot of

things that we could do in our society to improve our research and development, but we only have a certain number of dollars to do that with. If we go with this project which has obviously some scientific value, it is without a doubt going to jeopardize a whole slew of other science projects that will be reduced, and in the dissenting views there is a description of some of those science projects. I believe that if Members are for the superconducting super collider in the amounts that are funded in the bill, they will inevitably reduce a whole range of other science projects that have great value to our society.

Second of all, it is worth pointing out that we have just appropriated \$100 million next year for this project, and the authorization is for not only \$40-some-odd million this year, but in the outyears up to \$1.5 billion, and it seems to me incongruous that we would go ahead and authorize now more this year and for the outyears than we have already appropriated.

A vote for this amendment is a good way to save some dollars, I would say to my colleagues, at a time of very tight fiscal policy.

I must also tell you this: This is one of these projects that had great interest. It had great interest when we thought we were going to locate it in every State in the country. I sat at the authorization hearings, on the super collider, and I witnessed Governor after Governor after Governor come down and tell us that this is the greatest project in the history of the American civilization, and it just so happened that they were trying to get it located in their State. When, in fact, we pressed a lot of these Governors and other State officials about, "Well, if the project were not located in your State, how would you feel about it," the level of intensity dramatically reduced.

I do not want to say that this project is strictly a public works project, because I also believe that it has some scientific value, but I think it has taken on more of a public works orientation than science.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we should make that comparison, that is, coming back and saying we have to build a structure. It is not the structure that is the issue here at all. It is what we are going to use the structure for. It is like saying because we build a college laboratory that it is there for a public works program. It is the use of what we are going to make it. I think we should not clutter up this debate with the point of view of making the reference that this is a public works project, and even



it it were, it would not be the last bad thing in the world for America. The fact remains, for clarity, we have to build a structure to do this particular high-level-technology research facility, and without the structure, one cannot do it. I think that ought to be made clear right at the very beginning.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I did not say the project did not have some scientific value, but I do think that what has driven this thing for the last few years is the fact that many people wanted to see it built in their State, and that took over and kind of cloaked the scientific value of what we are doing.

The other point that I would say is this: When one talks to scientists not only in this country but around the world about this particular project, there is no unanimity that this is the way to go to deal with high-energy physics. A lot of folks say that these activities can be simulated. More and more now people are saying that one can do a much smaller hole in the ground than the one that we are talking about building here. I would hate to commit ourselves to \$1.5 billion, or however many dollars it is over a long-term period of time when the science is so dramatically changing in the area of high-energy physics.

This is a good amendment. It allows us to save some dollars at a time of enormous Federal deficits. It allows us to continue the research, \$100 million, which the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER] allows. It allows us to be in conformity with our appropriations bill which I believe the committee the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] reported to this floor, so Members will not have to vote against an amendment and, therefore, adding more money to the budget than what they voted for in the appropriation bill. Therefore, a vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER] is consistent with the appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GLICKMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is the gentleman aware that the basic magnet, the superconducting magnet, this 54-foot-long, 17-foot-in-diameter, very technologically intensive magnet, has still not been built to a specification that can be repeated, and that continuing with research and development before we go the whole 9 yards makes some sense?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I am not specifically aware of that, but I am specifi-

cally aware that there are a lot of scientific thresholds that we have got to jump through before we are really able to utilize a superconducting super collider, and that is another reason to adopt the Buechner amendment to perhaps not commit ourselves to a massive amount of out-of-year funding.

Mr. RITTER. The fact is we are not ready to go ahead with building 53 miles of these magnets since we do not have the first one.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I waded into this controversy with fear and trembling, but I believe there are several matters which should be emphasized and redrawn to the attention of this body.

First of all, I think we should remind ourselves that when the recommendation was made by the President of the United States that this should be a national priority, that the figures that were talked about were in the billions of dollars. That has been pruned or trimmed back now to where we are talking in terms of only millions of dollars.

I suggest to the Members that the appropriation for the SSC has already been reduced by some \$225 million, and if we adopt this amendment and continue to hammer away at it, we will not have enough money here to complete the survey work. I suggest that the attention of the House should be refocused on some testimony recently by eminent scientists in this country, some of whom place this project ahead of the space station.

□ 1040

Not having a background in science, it would be difficult for me, impossible for me to tick off at this time the benefits that will accrue to our fellows throughout the world if we proceed with this project. But I suggest that what is apparent and evident to me is that the body seems to be, some Members of the body, seem to be seized by a fear of the unknown.

I suggest we need to oppose this amendment. The \$147 million is certainly small enough to indicate that this is a project we should pursue, that this is a path we should continue on in this country, and I ask my fellow Members of the House to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri. I think what he would really prefer to do in his heart, as some others who have spoken, is to see the funding reduced to nothing so that we will have to abandon the project. I respectfully suggest that the funding has been reduced to bare minimum and that we should oppose this amendment.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VALENTINE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I just want to support the gentleman's argument and speak in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri. I feel that the position taken by the committee reflects a number of hours, hundreds of hours of hearings and deliberation in this area and I feel we must continue with at least that level of authorization or we run the risk of losing a project that is vitally important as we look to the future maintaining of the U.S. lead in the science and technology area.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VALENTINE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made a remark about some people have placed it in a higher priority over the space station. Dr. Press, of course, is in the National Science Foundation and is into pure science. But does the gentleman not admit that there is a national consensus about space whereas there really has been no national dialog, at least at the grassroots level, about superconductivity and the super collider in particular?

Mr. VALENTINE. I would say to the gentleman from Missouri I believe there has been significant and widespread discussion, and there is greater understanding of this program and of this project in the country.

Mr. BUECHNER. Excuse me, but if the gentleman will yield again, I am not talking about the scientific community, I am talking about the American public, the people who send us up here.

Mr. VALENTINE. I think the people send us up here for leadership, and the benefits of the space program are evident. We have had that to judge now for many, many years.

Mr. BUECHNER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VALENTINE. I do not think it is a fair comparison to say that because the SSC is not as well known as the space program that we should abandon it or that we should cripple it.

Mr. BUECHNER. If the gentleman will yield one more time, the Speaker of his House in the North Carolina State Legislature came out with a statement that if there were State participation he was going to be opposed to it, even if North Carolina were the winner, is that correct, if State participation were required?

Mr. VALENTINE. I do not want to presume to speak for the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of North Carolina. He is an outstanding man and a good Democrat. But that is not his decision.

I have seen him quoted, but I am not willing to take the position whether he is for it or against it.

Mr. BUECHNER. That was on the AP, was it not?

Mr. VALENTINE. I do not know where it was, but there has been some statement. I would say he has made some statements which indicated that maybe he had some question about it. But that has nothing to do with the relevance of the matter before us.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words. With all due respect to the gentleman from Missouri, it seems to me that on this, his birthday, what he is trying to do is to kill the commitment for the superconducting super collider.

After a great deal of work and study and review and struggle in a bipartisan manner by our Science, Space, and Technology Committee, we came to the excruciating conclusion of what ought to be authorized. I submit, and it might sound self-serving, but I think the authorizing committee is certainly where the real expertise is located in regard to making commitments such as this.

But in the bill we do refer to nonsite specific development activities with an emphasis on collider and injector activities. We use the word technical systems development, operating expenses and capital equipment, and then for the outyears we refer to construction. That is as much of a commitment as the authorizing committee wanted to make. We whittled the President's request from \$363 million down to \$147 million, and I think the 6-percent cut down takes it down to less than that. It is a very modest proposal, but I think it is just enough so that we can make that commitment, and I understand just enough so that we will be able to bring the foreign commitments into the picture, which is tremendously important.

I think that if we are unable to make decisions in this area, as Congress has been unable to do in a number of crucial areas, we are going to find that the SSC indeed is going to be built somewhere else. Let me quote from a letter which was sent to me by Steven Errede who is a physicist at the University of Illinois. He said:

At present, the Europeans are hesitating on their plans to build the LHC, large Hadron collider. The Russians also have plans for building a new accelerator which will be highly competitive with the United States' own SSC. Both groups are watching what will happen here in the United States. If we do not go forward with the SSC the Europeans will certainly build the LHC. The foreign countries now willing to help fund the SSC may instead choose to fund the LHC in order to maintain progress in this field.

Although the gentleman from Missouri professes, and I think he is sincere in his statement, that he does not wish to kill the SSC, I suggest to him that is exactly what he is doing.

Fortunately or unfortunately this project has been presented in a bit of a lottery environment because a lot of States understandably are interested in it. A lot of States and a lot of entities within States are interested in the space station and other grandiose projects. I have supported the NASA budget authorization, and obviously, yes, States are interested in this. Many of the States that came to this Congress, and I might say the great majority of scientists who testified over a number of days before our Energy, Research and Development Subcommittee, were solidly in favor of this. I might add too that when people say this may crowd out other sciences, they seem to look only to the SSC as the bad guy on the books. I just cannot understand that. The SSC is a tool of the future and small science is going to use that tool, Mr. Chairman. There are people from all over this Nation, small colleges and universities and professors and postdoctoral students who will be coming to this citadel, wherever it is built. And yes, it is not as easy to understand, for instance, as the space station. But it is one of the most exciting projects, and as far as education is concerned a project that will lure students and bring into science many thousands and thousands of students who would not otherwise have gone into science.

I hear the buzz word competitiveness all the time in this Congress, and it seems to me what I hear is people are anti-long-term basic R&D, especially if it has a civilian orientation to it, but something like this can be shared all over this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] has expired.

(On request of Mr. RITTER and by unanimous consent, Mr. FAWELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, let me take 30 seconds to complete my remarks. We are talking about a civilian oriented R&D program, and I support competitiveness. But I look upon this in a way as the blasphemy of the get rich quick. We are going to grab the competitiveness, let the Nobel Laureates go elsewhere, steal the technology of the future from Nobel Laureates from other countries just because we have to be first in competitiveness, and I think that is selling our science infrastructure that our children have a right to, and I do not support that whatsoever.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAWELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have the greatest respect for the capability and the integrity of the gentleman from Illinois. We work together closely on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

But, as the gentleman knows, this project is basically in his district or surrounding his district, and I think that makes a very interesting point for all of the Members of this House. The great majority of the people who are getting up and speaking on this issue do have a significant vested interest in pushing this project forward so that they, as one of the seven States competing, can have a final shot at it.

If Members look around the room, Mr. Chairman, they will find that most of the Members who are getting up are from the State of Illinois, which is a lead competitor, and from the State of Texas. The chairman and vice chairman have exerted their leadership on this, and they are indeed leaders in the science community, as is the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD], chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development. But as Members look at the vast majority, there are vested interests at stake.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. FAWELL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. FAWELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

(On request of Mr. ROE and by unanimous consent, Mr. FAWELL was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I think this point is a very important point that this dialogue is covering. But let me remind both the gentleman from Pennsylvania and those who are listening, do we run America's scientific programs and its technology programs as to what State the particular project is to be located? If we do, we are in a very, very sad state of affairs.

Let us take number one the facts of the issue. The facts of the issue are that 39 States had the right to participate and 39 States did participate in the first preliminary program. All 39 participated. Do we want to say that those 39 States participated because if they did not get the project they were going to run home, and they were going to leave America bare naked because they were not successful? If that is so, then everything we do in defense, everything we do in space, everything that is done in this country then would only inure to the benefit of one State.



The question is not that the super collider relates to a particular State or a particular site. It relates to the people of this country, and the technology and knowledge of this universe is what it amounts to. That is No. 1.

And in a fair process, in a fair process those first States were eliminated. Now there are seven States left. It reminds me of the 11 Indians, and then there were 9, and then there were 8, and then there were 7, and then there was 1.

I am from New Jersey. We cannot fit that in my State. If we could fit that in my State, I would be out here fighting as hard as Illinois and Arizona and every other State in the running.

The issue is the super collider for the United States of America and the scientists of our country, not what State it would be located in. And I would assume that those States, all 39, and these Members in this House who participated would be really stating an atrocity to the American people to come back and say I only did it because it may have been located in my State or my district. Then the answer has to come back as to what is important to America. Did you do it because of the alms, because of the money you were going to get into your State, or did you do it because it was important for the country?

□ 1055

And I do not think it is fair to nail down any State whatsoever in their integrity or their honesty.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAWELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN].

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that that is rather unfair to put it on a pork barrel basis. As you know, as the chairman said, 39 States competed but my home State of New Mexico is out of the running. And I did not drop off my support for the super collider simply because my State was not eligible.

So some of us do happen to think that it is a good project; even the sponsor of the amendment. He is not saying he is against the super collider. He is trying to bring some reality to the budgeting process is what he is doing. His State is not eligible, he is not for the thing because of pork barrel.

So that is kind of an unfair thing to say to the gentleman from Illinois that he is supporting it because it is pork barrel.

He has assured me and has told me—we worked together before the elimination of the 32 States and at that time he said if Illinois is not chosen, "I will still go ahead with the support for the super collider," and I am sure he would have. So that is an unfair state-

ment to classify it as pork barrel as far as the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I might say I think my honor has been fully protected and I appreciate it.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAWELL. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, California is no longer in the running for this project yet my commitment to it is just as strong as it has ever been. I think that is true with most Members who have supported this project all along.

I believe the amendment before us now would simply send a signal that we often send from this body when we start a project, a good project, we send a tentative signal that says we are really not committed to it. And I think this administration and this Congress has already made a commitment—or the administration has—and we ought not to send a signal that says that our commitment is only half-hearted. We ought to go all the way with what the committee is recommending and I would oppose the amendment.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do want to say one thing. I want to perhaps reiterate one thing that this is the authorizing committee. I know there are a lot of other views in the appropriating committees and so forth and so on, but I have a great deal of respect for the indepth review and study on both sides of the aisle, and what our staffs have done. They have worked with it, they have struggled with it. We have had these debates within the authorizing committee and we came to a consensus.

In my view, although I speak with perhaps some lack of objectivity in the eyes of some because I come from Illinois, I think the decision of the committee should be upheld.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I first would like to start out by saying that the drafters of this amendment mean well and I commend them for trying to save some money from this horrendous deficit problem that we face. I too am trying in my own way to cut. Evidently, our directions have been a little bit different. But today we are discussing the super collider as if it is just a money issue. I say that is a problem with America. This is a policy issue.

My God, we have people in China that are working for 17 cents an hour, people in our own hemisphere, Central America, working for as low as 35 to 40 cents an hour. How is America going to compete if it is not in technology and the gains that we could make through policy commitments, then where do we go as a nation?

Now I have heard all of this talk about pork barrel. The first point I want to make is Ohio is out of it. I would like to see Ohio get it. Ohio invested \$1 million of its own money to show the assets of the State that would really be a good venture for the collider. The point is it was not accepted.

But this project is going to be located in America. And I do not know of any chairman since I have been in Congress who is any fairer than Mr. ROE. Anybody that had a shot at the collider took their best shot and there were good standards to select, and the criteria made a lot of sense.

So I would like to say that here we are as a Congress again looking a little bit wishy-washy. I think we have a three-year authorization; we should let the world know that America is going forward, we will retain our leadership in science and technology and that is the only way we can compete.

If we look at the past, folks, we let the Japanese come in and take photos of our steel mills and they went back and they took those pictures, they took our technology, they built the steel mills and now they have the steel jobs.

So I think it is prudent that we move forward with the superconductor super collider. We do not show this wishy-washy slipping around type of attitude that seems to exist here but let us show our commitment.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment that is being offered, while well-intentioned, is inappropriate for this particular project. It would reduce funding from \$147 million, less the 6-percent reduction in the authorizing bill, to \$100 million.

Now, \$100 million is a nothing figure in terms of what it takes to build this project. It is more than we need to continue research, but it is not enough to actually begin construction of the project.

I would point out that the President's budget requested \$363 million; the budget conference resolution between the House and the Senate funds it at \$140 million; the Senate has indicated they are willing to fund it at a higher level, \$175 to \$200 million, and this \$100 million number is the number that the Committee on Appropriations and the appropriation bill came out with, but it is really not enough to begin the project.

I would like to also point out that when our good friend from Pennsylvania talks about vested interests, I think we would all plead guilty to that. We do have a vested interest and our vested interest is to keep the United States No. 1 in high technology

research which does result, if you stay No. 1 in the research, you are going to stay No. 1 in the spinoffs, in the commercialization that results from such research.

And this project does have value. We are talking about it like it is just some big pork barrel project, but it is a lot more than that.

The United States has been No. 1 in high energy physics research since the turn of the 20th century. Because of that we have seen such things develop in this country as radar, as television, as microchip technology, magnetic resonance imaging and now we are at the forefront of superconductivity research and we are at that point because we have been emphasizing research on the superconductor project itself.

Our goal is nothing more than to keep the United States No. 1. I would point out that according to Dr. Alvin W. Trivelpiece, formerly with the Department of Energy, claims one-third of our gross national product is directly related to research that has been done in the high energy physics field.

The United States is not going to be No. 1 in low labor costs and we do not want to be. The United States, except in a few rare cases, cannot be No. 1 in low material costs. The only thing that we can be No. 1 in is using our brainpower, using our technology and that requires that we do projects like the SSC.

Now this project does have broad support. I have in my hand a listing of various distinguished scientists and Government leaders from around the country who have spoken of their support for the project:

Leon M. Lederman, Director, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory.

Chris Quigg, Deputy Director, SSC Central Design Group.

John Bardeen, Professor of Physics, University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, Nobel Prizes in Physics, 1972, 1956.

S.D. Bechtel, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Bechtel Group, Inc.

James J. Blanchard, Governor, State of Michigan.

J. Fred Bucy, Chairman, Texas Scientific Advisory Council.

Peter Carruthers, Professor of Physics, University of Arizona.

William P. Clements, Jr., Governor, State of Texas.

J.W. Cronin, Professor of Physics, University of Chicago, Nobel Prize in Physics, 1980.

Sidney Drell, Professor of Physics, Stanford University.

George B. Field, Professor of Astronomy, Harvard University.

Val L. Fitch, Professor of Physics, Princeton University, Nobel Prize in Physics, 1980.

Paul H. Frampton, Professor of Physics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Robert A. Frosch, Vice President, General Motors Corporation.

Mary K. Gaillard, Staff Scientist, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, and Professor of Physics, University of California at Berkeley.

Robert W. Galvin, Chairman of the Board, Motorola, Incorporated.

David P. Gardner, President, University of California.

Sheldon L. Glashow, Higgins Professor of Physics, Mellon Professor of the Sciences, Harvard University, Nobel Prize in Physics, 1979.

Mary L. Good, President, Engineered Materials Research, Allied Signal, Incorporated, and Robert W. Broach, Acting Director, Physical Chemistry and Surface Science, Allied Signal, Incorporated.

Richard D. Harza, Chairman of the Board, Harza Engineering Company.

J.K. Hulm, Chief Scientist, Westinghouse R&D Center.

Stanley O. Ikenberry, President, University of Illinois.

G.A. Keyworth II, Director of Research, Hudson Institute.

T.D. Lee, Professor of Physics, Columbia University, Nobel Prize in Physics, 1957.

James G. Martin, Governor, North Carolina.

Boyce D. McDaniel, Professor of Physics, Cornell University.

Ned R. McWherter, Governor, State of Tennessee.

Rose Mofford, Governor, State of Arizona.

Uriel Nauenberg, Professor of Physics, University of Colorado, Boulder.

James J. O'Connor, Chairman of the Board, Commonwealth Edison.

W.B. Offutt, Vice President, Technical Management, Eaton Corporation.

George E. Pake, Vice President, Corporate Research Group (retired), Xerox Corporation.

Martin Perl, Professor of Physics, Stanford University.

Lee G. Pondrom, Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin.

Roy R. Romer, Governor, State of Colorado.

David N. Schramm, Louis Block Professor of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of Chicago.

Alan Schriesheim, Director, Argonne National Laboratory.

Roy F. Schwitters, Professor of Physics, Harvard University.

Glenn T. Seaborg, Professor of Chemistry, University of California at Berkeley, Associate Director, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Nobel Prize in Chemistry, 1951.

Emilio Segre, Professor of Physics, University of California at Berkeley, Nobel Prize in Physics, 1959.

David A. Shirley, Director, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Professor of Chemistry, University of California at Berkeley.

James R. Thompson, Governor, State of Illinois.

Charles H. Townes, Professor of Physics, University of California at Berkeley, Nobel Prize in Physics, 1964.

Sam Treiman, Professor of Physics, Princeton University.

George Trilling, Staff Scientist, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, Professor of Physics, University of California at Berkeley.

Alvin W. Trivelpiece, Executive Officer, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Arnold R. Weber, President, Northwestern University.

Steven Weinberg, Professor of Physics, University of Texas at Austin, Nobel Prize in Physics, 1979.

Victor F. Weisskopf, Professor of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

R.R. Wilson, Professor of Physics, Cornell University.

Michael S. Witherell, Professor of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara.  
Edward Witten, Member, The Institute for Advanced Study.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to submit this for the RECORD, but it is lengthy, but I would like to read one excerpt from the report by Dr. George Keyworth, now director of research at Hudson Institute and formerly President Reagan's science adviser. He is talking about maintaining our preeminence in the world today. He is talking about projects that will do this. And I would like to quote:

One is the SSC. It's going to unequivocally re-establish the United States as the world's leader in a forefront area of physical research. And the SSC is going to send a message to Americans and to the rest of the world—the message that we intend to be the best at something we believe to be of fundamental importance and that we're willing to commit ourselves to make it happen. Long before the SSC is completed, it's going to influence the way people think about national priorities and about national resolve. The SSC is going to drive home the message to our students that it's important to study math and science—because pursuit of scientific knowledge has been elevated in national priority and because they understand that their futures are tied to it. The SSC is also going to catalyze heightened support for education, and maybe we'll be able to attract more of the kind of teachers that our schools have been painfully losing for the past twenty years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON of Texas was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this project does have broad support on both sides of the aisle. It has broad support in the country. The amendment, while well-intentioned, should be defeated. The \$100 million does not in any way establish our resolve to maintain our No. 1 status in high energy physics. So I would hope that we would vote this amendment down and continue forward with the project.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for my colleague from Texas and when he talks about the science base that the superconductor super collider gives to America that is exactly what the issue is. It is not SSC versus no science, it is the SSC versus superconductivity, high temperature superconductor research. It is the SSC versus ceramics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has again expired.



(On request of Mr. RITTER and by unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON of Texas was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Mr. Chairman, it is the SSC versus photonics research, biotechnology research, ceramics research, all of these programs are going to be put on hold and cut. The fact is if we are looking for a 19-percent increase this year for NSF, we will not get it because this kind of money is not in the budget. The fact is we are looking to expand these novel new sciences, yes; we are for science, too, those of us who are opposed to this massive \$1.6 billion commitment are for science. We want America—the gentleman from Ohio talks about the steel industry—we want to have an effective steel industry, we want to have an effective manufacturing base. The fact is the SSC robs Peter to pay Paul and all the people that the gentleman is talking about are high energy physicists who support this and those companies are vested interest companies who stand only to gain from building the SSC.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You know, to raise the specter—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has again expired.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, I object to the 5 minutes, I would not mind a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was moving to his feet; the gentleman has objected.

The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] has expired.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move the strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by yielding to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of my colleagues: This is bound to be a spirited debate, obviously. There are very, very strong feelings, as there should be. But I would hope, and it would be at least this chairman's position, that everybody should have the right to speak in any way they can and I do hope that as we go through if someone asks someone to yield or we need a little bit of additional time that we respect both sides and not cut people off. Otherwise, we cut off knowledge and cutting off knowledge destroys the whole debate.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee, we went through this debate, I will tell the Members of the House, in the committee; we are going at it here on the floor. It is a very spirited debate; I think that is worthwhile because we are dealing with a very major issue here.

One of the problems is that virtually everything that everybody says in these debates is true. Is the SSC good science? Of course it is. Sure. There is absolutely nothing that I could say that would indicate that we are going to get bad science out of the SSC. It would be wonderful to be able to have the project.

Does it have to be located somewhere? Of course it does. If we are going to build it it has got to go to somebody and of course those people are going to benefit from having it located there.

□ 1110

Do they have a stake in getting it there if they possibly can? Of course, they do, and, sure they are going to stand up and speak for it. Everything everybody says here is absolutely true. What we need to focus on, in this gentleman's opinion, is the fact that we are really dealing with a forerunner issue that will consume us in the science community over the next several years, and it is this: How much big science are we going to do versus how much small science are we going to do? What are we going to endorse in terms of big science versus what we are going to endorse in terms of small science? How many big projects can we do without totally obliterating any kind of ability to do small projects?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. That is going to be a very, very key issue, because let me tell the Members that there is an awful lot of very, very good science out there. Every university that I know of has a major science program that it is interested in advancing, and every one of them is doing good things with it, and every one of them would like more money. Even if we had an unlimited

tap of money available to us in this committee or in our appropriations, there would still not be enough to do all the good science that needs to be done. And we need to focus on the fact that we do not have an unlimited tap of money available.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Let me finish my statement, and then I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, if we had that unlimited tap of money, this project would be fantastic, it would be great. So would the space station. So would any number of other projects—fusion reactors and all kinds of other things we could come up with. They would all be wonderful to do.

If we had an unlimited amount of money, there are all kinds of small science projects that could be done, not only in universities but in individual research labs by individuals. We could give money to everybody, and we would be on that leading technology edge.

The fact is that we are not going to have an unlimited tap of money, and we are going to have to prioritize. So that leads us really to this discussion. Let me tell the Members what my concern is. My concern does not go to where the project is going to be located or whether or not somebody is talking about it from the standpoint of whether their State benefits; it does not come from the standpoint of whether or not it is good science. I have got to tell the Members this: I am haunted by the specter of Clinch River, because there is a project where we spent hundreds of millions of very valuable dollars only to cancel it in the end. So I am very, very concerned that with the division in the legislative body that we have, because there is division in the committee of jurisdiction here about this project, with that division I am concerned that we are going to end up spending hundreds of million of dollars and never complete this project.

What will happen then? Hundreds of millions of dollars will be lost to infinitely more important science projects all over this country. We could have universities and communities denied money so that money could go here into a project that we do not have an intention of completing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I will yield after I have finished.

Mr. Chairman, I have got to tell the Members that I am worried about that, and it seems to me it does make sense to put the money up front for some R&D to find out whether or not we can at least prove conceptually some things that will be needed to go into this project. But we should not go beyond that at the present time until we can get a greater consensus. I would say to my chairman, and I would say to the vice chairman that we do not even have a consensus within our own committee. If we cannot have a consensus with our own committee that has a consensus on most other science projects, how in the world can we expect there to be a consensus in the country and how in the world can we expect there to be a consensus in the Congress? We have got to achieve that before we can move ahead aggressively at this time. We do not have that at the present time, and that worries me because I see this becoming a project that we can spend hundreds of millions of dollars on and not get anywhere.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, let me yield to the gentleman from Michigan, and then I will yield later to the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD]. Other Members have asked me to yield also, and I will yield to the gentlewoman from Rhode Island [Miss SCHNEIDER]. I yield first to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me just remind the gentleman that yesterday he stood in the well on the floor of this body and praised our NASA budget authorization on the basis that for the first time in many years we got back on the track of the discipline and the commitments of multiyear funding.

Let me also remind the gentleman that in Dr. Frank Press' comments before the National Academy of Sciences which dealt with the problem of prioritizing these major kinds of decisions we face in science and technology, whether it be mapping human genome, biotechnology, applied technologies, or the space station, this project in his ranking was above the space station which the gentleman praised yesterday for multiyear funding.

Let me also add very quickly that the funding for university research on any number of these other areas of biotechnology, ceramics and all is not being reduced but is also being increased to address our commitment under NSF in long-term engineering research.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, but let me also tell the gentleman that he knows as well as I do that there is politics within science, too.

Frank Press tends to come down on the side of high energy physics. That is fine. That is his determination of priorities.

I will tell the gentleman that I did stand here yesterday in favor of the NASA budget, and one of the things in that NASA budget is a very big science project that we are committing ourselves to as a nation—the space station.

My question before us today is, How many of those projects can we do before we do begin to have an impact? The gentleman says it does not have impact at the present time on small science. Let me remind the gentleman that we are already spending in this budget \$137 million. That will go up enormously in years hence. The gentleman cannot tell us, with the limited resources available today, that we will be able to fund those enormous increases in spending and not have an impact on small science somewhere along the line. I just do not have any belief that it can be done without having an impact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has again expired.

(On request of Mrs. LLOYD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the concerns of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Certainly there is no Member of this body that remembers the demise of Clinch River anymore than I do.

Mr. WALKER. The gentlewoman would have great knowledge about that.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned about what the gentleman describes. We are stewards of big science and small science, and that is the reason we have provided the money for other science programs, for RHIC, for the advanced photon source, for CIT, and for CEBAF.

We cut the SSC budget request \$225 million so we would not be a big science project that adversely affects other science.

We also included \$10 million for university research. So I would say to the gentleman that his concerns, although they are real and they are very sincere, I want to assure the gentleman we have taken care of the other science activities. This is our commitment, and if we cannot make our SSC commitment today, we are saying to the rest of the world that we are not sincere about scientific excellence. There is no doubt that this would be the signal we would be sending.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentlewoman that I simply do

not agree with that. I do say that in the out-year spending we are talking about, for the space station alone we are talking about a commitment of spending somewhere in the early 1990's of about \$2 billion a year. For SSC we may be talking in the vicinity of \$500 to \$600 million a year in those same years. We are talking about finding somewhere in the science budget maybe as much as \$3 billion a year more than we are presently spending just for those two projects.

I know the gentlewoman has taken good care of all those projects in this year's budget. My problem is that when we get out into the next couple of years, out in the early 1990's, where are we going to find \$3 billion without taking it out of somebody's hide?

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. LLOYD. This is the exact question I posed to the Secretary of Energy. We had the firm commitment of the Secretary of Energy that the administration was not going to support the SSC project at the expense of these other science activities. I share the gentleman's concerns.

Mr. WALKER. But I have got to tell the gentlewoman that the Secretary of Energy is not going to be there.

Mrs. LLOYD. The Secretary of Energy is committed to address these things.

Mr. WALKER. I am sure the Secretary of Energy made a very firm commitment. I will tell the gentlewoman, though, that the Secretary of Energy is not going to be there after January of the next year, and we are talking about the early 1990's. What about the commitment then? We had great commitments all the way along on something like Clinch River, but somehow or other those ran out too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just want to advise my colleagues that we do not want to have one particular Member or one particular side constantly dominate the debate here. I will not object at this point, but I will feel constrained to object should it happen again.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.



Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that the chairman of the committee, I think, made a good point a few minutes ago, that we ought not to be cutting off this debate. I will be glad to yield to Members to assure that we have a dialog here.

Mr. Chairman, let me yield first to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Miss SCHNEIDER].

Miss SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I will seek my own opportunity to speak at a later time, but now I simply want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and say that I think that he has really put his finger on the pulse of what the question should be as we go further through this discussion. It is very clear to me that we are talking about saving \$1.5 billion with this amendment. The gentleman and I support high energy physics. We support the expenditures that have been determined by the Appropriations Committee of \$100 million for this year. There is no question, to reinforce the gentleman's comments, that other parts of the science budget have in fact been reduced. Other parts of the DOE budget over the last several years have been significantly reduced, and to be exact rather than generic, the nuclear energy budget itself has gone down 35 percent. The fossil energy, coal, oil, natural gas has been reduced by 67 percent, energy conservation has been reduced by 56 percent, and renewable energy supplied by 82 percent.

□ 1120

Let me also further reinforce the gentleman's comments, that it is not just those disciplines that are going to be reduced further in the future by being squeezed out by the SSC, but we are going to see a whole variety of different science projects, perhaps even some big ones, but definitely small ones being squeezed out.

You will recall that the administration has supported doubling the NSF budget, but last year that did not become a reality because we did not have adequate funds.

So all the bottom line is, where do we find the adequate money to go beyond the \$100 million? I do not think it is there. I do not think it is the fiscally responsible position to take to agree to have more than \$100 million.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify the discussion about Frank Press, the president of—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has again expired.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are here debating as if no cuts have taken place in the history of this authorization. We have had cut after cut, State-by-State has fallen aside.

The gentleman from California, Mr. RON PACKARD, still supports this thrust totally, even though his State was the barb of many of us saying, "Don't put it in California because—earthquake, earthquake, earthquake." We have heard that so many times, I am sure that we are sick of it.

Then I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and to the gentleman from Illinois, "God, send an earthquake up to Illinois so those of us from the other States can say earthquake, earthquake, Illinois."

But I think the gentleman from Illinois still supports this wherever it goes, as will this gentleman from Texas, when it is decided where it should be.

Now, the President started with what—something over \$360 million in this. It has been cut and pared down to \$147 million, and there are those who want to continue to cut it down. There are those who will try to tie the albatross of foreign participation to it in an effort to kill or lessen this.

Further reduction, Mr. Chairman, of this authorization I think sends exactly the wrong message to the potential foreign participants in the SSC, if we are to get them. A reduction will say to the world that we are not sure that we want to build this project at this time.

The House leadership supports the bill. The scientific community supports the bill. The SSC funding is at a level with what the House supported in the conference agreement on the budget resolution.

As a matter of fact, we are in a race for excellence here. We are in a race to make a determination as to whether we want to reach for that position of scientific eminence that we knew in the late forties and early fifties.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania says maybe we have a vested interest. I do have a vested interest. Most of us have a vested interest in this. That vested interest, Mr. Chairman, is to reach for a level of economic prosperity, reach for a level of scientific achievement, and yes, even to reach for a level of geopolitical strength that this country has not known in the last 25 years.

Now, I am parochial. I would like to see it in Texas. Better than that, I would like to see it in east Texas. Better than that, I would like to see it in my district, but I am parochial for the United States of America. I want to see it in this country, and that is what this argument is all about today. That is the effect of lessening this.

I visited CERN. I have visited the area near Hamburg there. CERN is currently analyzing plans to expand their large electron position. If they do that by adding a second ring, that is going to sap European participation that we need. We need a firm commitment to the project this year.

Is it cost-effective? Well, there again, I visited with Dr. Carlos Rubio, the Nobel Prize winner, who is there at CERN now and others. They say and they indicated that there is a \$3 to \$4 economic spinoff for every dollar invested. Like the water projects that this board and this committee supports and this Congress supports, it is cost-effective. It comes back to us many, many times.

I hope we will not show the timidity that will affect our innate ability to encourage those overseas and, yes, to encourage the States to participate in the building of this fine facility, and I urge that we defeat the amendment.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, I know the cost spinoff that the gentleman talks about.

Is the gentleman familiar with our own CBO estimate that severely challenges that spinoff estimate?

Mr. HALL of Texas. Well, I am sure there are challenges on every side, and the gentleman well knows that there are reasons to support and there are reasons to oppose. You can give off the reason that it saps up the scientific community's money. You can give the reason that we need it for the thrust in space. There are legitimate positions on each side, I grant that. I am simply stating my own.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further to me, I think, though, it is important that we point out that the estimate by the first individual the gentleman stated on the spinoff, those are people directly interested in the project as possible participants. I am not talking about congressional participants now. I am talking about the scientific community; whereas I think the CBO tried to be at least objective. We use it here on the floor to either support or deny many projects.

The object I think is that the CBO is supposed to be an objective, as opposed to an interested party.

I would hope that all the people before they vote in this House would

take the opportunity to read both sides, both the CBO and those people from the energy community that have a vested interest in the project.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(At the request of Mr. BARTON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HALL of Texas was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman for yielding.

I would like to just make a few comments with respect to the concern of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] about the big science, little science debate. I personally think that is a red herring. I think big science helps little science.

I would point out that in the fifties when we were all worried that the Soviets were going to overtake us in space, we started the space program. That did not hurt little science. That helped little science. It was obviously a big project, but it encouraged students to study to be engineers. It encouraged studies in mathematics. It encouraged a wide range of research into all kinds of activities.

I think a project like the SSC is a catalyst for little science, not an opponent of little science.

With regard to the comment of my colleague, the gentlewoman from Rhode Island, about hurting other projects, and some were mentioned specifically, those are true numbers, but those cuts did not come because of an emphasis on big science. It came because the Reagan administration decided to deemphasize its role in Government involvement in some of those areas, not because they wanted to put the money somewhere else.

Miss SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Rhode Island.

Miss SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, in response to that remark that it may have been the Reagan administration that suggested that we reduce the energy budgets overall, but if we are calling now for one-fifth of the increase in the Department of Energy's budget to be singled out for use by the SSC, then certainly we are robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] has expired.

Miss SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this proposal. There are three specific reasons that I would like to outline for those of you who may not have made up your minds yet and who

are thinking, what is the crux of this argument?

It seems to me there are three basic points we should keep in mind. First of all, this particular amendment does allow us to conform to the appropriations bill of \$100 million for research and development in 1989. One hundred million dollars would be a threefold increase, by the way, in the current SSC R&D budget, a threefold increase, which is an increase more significant than many other projects have gotten.

The second thing is that we should keep in mind that we could have future options open to us by providing \$100 million for this year and this year alone. Those future options are very important to this debate. We have hardly begun to touch on the role of foreign participation. It is very obvious that since this research that we are investing our Federal tax dollars in is going to benefit Japan, France, Germany, our economic competitors, then certainly some of those costs should be shared by these foreign countries.

DOE has also said that foreign countries have expressed an interest in funding anywhere between 40 and 50 percent of the project, but the committee bill will not allow foreign countries to contribute more than 25 percent.

Well, if we are dealing with a budget deficit, and we know that our economic competitors, yet allies, will be benefiting from our expenditures in research today, is it not a better idea to encourage them to make that 40- to 50-percent investment in research also today? This is not provided for in the committee bill.

What about State contributions? We heard from various spokesmen from Texas, from Illinois, from different parts. There will be many local benefits available to that State which is ultimately chosen. There will certainly be and should be a financial contribution on the part of the State.

As a matter of fact, several States, such as Texas and Illinois, have already expressed a willingness to make substantial cash contributions; but, another flaw of this bill, is that the committee bill removes all State cost-sharing considerations.

Now, should there not be some level of cost-sharing taking place if we are in fact as fiscally constrained in this Congress as we say?

Third, the extent of support within the scientific community is dispersed. With all due respect to some of my colleagues who were name dropping about Nobel Laureates, each one of those Nobel Laureates happens to be a high energy physicist. But if we move beyond those, we recognize that there is not unanimity in the scientific community. The majority of people from our diverse disciplines in science say that this will eventually drain re-

search dollars away from the more productive research.

Now, let me share with you just one quote from a scientist. This is James Krumhansl, who is with the American Physical Society. He is president-elect. He says what I am now attempting to convey to all of you:

We are living in a deficit economy and we have to decide what will yield the most national benefits for our dollars. I don't see that the SSC has any immediate relevance to our technological or economic competitiveness.

Second, let me share with you another message. This one is from the private sector. We have had many vice presidents, corporate vice presidents of different industries, whether it be the Monsanto Co. or National Starch and Chemical Corp., which says that there are clearly other research areas in need of funding where the practical and economic gains will be greater and can be measured in lives saved or in quality of life improvements or simply jobs created for our people, rather than scientific advancement in a narrow area, and the possibility of Nobel laureates.

The bottom line, however, is that there are differing opinions, whether they be from the academic community or from the business community, but we must not deny the fact that we are not in a military war at this time. We are in an economic trade war. If we continue to invest our dollars in research and enable our allies to benefit from our innovations, then we are going to be the economic losers and our standard of living will continue to lose. If we keep in mind that right now as we look at the entire Federal R&D budget, 67 percent of our Federal tax dollar now is being used for defense research, that leaves another very small piece of the pie.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman suspend.

Before the gentleman from New York proceeds, the Chair will remind Members that the committee has spent an hour and 20 minutes on this amendment. There are other amendments which follow this amendment that are already filed with the Clerk. Today being Friday and the leadership having previously announced the intention of approximately a 3 p.m. departure, the Chair will just remind Members in the Chamber that this is only the first of a series of amendments and that it has been debated for quite some time.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. Of course, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to the Chair, the chairman of



the committee is prepared to ask for the Committee to rise at this point, if that is the desire of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not the desire of the Chair. The gentleman may continue as long as he feels necessary.

Mr. ROE. I would suggest to the distinguished gentleman in the chair, for whom I have the highest regard, that perhaps this is the most important amendment and the most important discussion we will have in the whole scientific community this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to sit here as long as the Members are willing to debate the issue.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1135

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important at this point to respond in part to the distinguished gentlewoman from Rhode Island [Miss SCHNEIDER] who spoke previously. We must make the point abundantly clear that the issue here is not \$1.5 billion in cuts. That is totally fallacious. It is absolutely totally fallacious because in effect it means that Congress has to act, No. 1; then we have to cut something out.

Mr. Chairman, we are doing what is the proper thing to do here. We are providing the resources that we believe as a committee are necessary and it is up to the Congress to speak to that issue, not only this year but the following year and the following year. So to sow the seed that this will cut \$1.5 billion is first of all erroneous. Second, if the gentleman would yield further, it is important that we respond so the debate is in continuity. We talk about future foreign participation. The committee deliberately allowed an amount of foreign participation not to exceed 25 percent. However, there will be an amendment that will be offered that will expand that. We deliberately did that because we wanted to put a ceiling on foreign participation so that we in the United States were not going to give the whole high energy physics away to foreign participation. We did not want to have a situation evolve where the Japanese would come back and then say that yes, they will participate but they want all the magnets to be made in Japan, or they want all the magnets to be made in Italy. It was carefully tailored and crafted and very well explained as my colleagues know throughout this entire process. So foreign participation is important but not when we give away the whole program to the other people throughout the world.

It was also mentioned that State contribution was a factor. Everybody on that committee knows one thing and one thing very clearly and it has

nothing to do with partisan politics or anything to do with States. How anybody can provide a request for proposal that would be so cockamamie including the Department of Energy that came back and said that we will have a little envelope and we will put the envelope on the shelf and we cannot open the envelope because we want to level the playing field because Texas may put in more money or Illinois may put in more money or California may put in more money, is sheer lunacy in my judgment. I am sure everybody on the committee agreed to that.

But that does not vitiate the point of view that the States will be putting up substantial funding which they have agreed to do. There will be another amendment that will further explain that in more detail.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER].

While I understand his concern and motivation, I believe his effort is misguided. Throughout the year, I've worked with the Budget Committee and others to ensure adequate funding of this vital project. I am also pleased that the energy and water appropriations bill for fiscal year 1989 contained \$100 million for the continued study of the superconducting super collider [SSC].

However, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee—the committee vested with the responsibility to determine scientific priorities—supports an authorization level of \$147.7 million for fiscal year 1989. They, better than most of us, have more fully discussed this project, and have determined the SSC can bring to our Nation and the scientific community a multitude of benefits.

I firmly believe the SSC will readily surpass the capabilities of existing particle accelerators, and launch us into the next generation of high energy particle physics. The Science, Space, and Technology Committee has recommended what I hope will be a multiyear authorization that will bring this project to fruition in a timely and cost-efficient manner.

While I appreciate the concerns that have been voiced by the gentleman from Missouri and others, I regret I must oppose this amendment because I believe it is shortsighted and misguided.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I would like to answer my colleague, the gentlewoman from Rhode Island [Miss SCHNEIDER], who has been such an effective contributor to the work of this committee. Yes, this is a major project. Yes, the fiscal year 1989 authorization level is a significant one, \$147 million, albeit it is 59 percent less

than the administration's request. This program has already been cut. But I think the gentlewoman from Rhode Island is absolutely right. We ought to be making this judgment based on whether we want to commit ourselves to a \$5 billion program. If we do not want to commit ourselves to a \$5 billion program, if we do not think this project is important enough, then we ought to vote down the funding entirely. We should not fool around. We ought to either go for it or decide to put our funding someplace else.

Somebody previously mentioned Dr. Frank Press, who thinks this is a very high priority item. My colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, said that Dr. Press' support is only his opinion, as if Dr. Press was just one of any number of people. Dr. Frank Press is Chairman of the National Academy of Sciences. He is one of America's most distinguished scientists. He thinks it is important for our country to emerge as a serious competitor in high energy physics basic research, the kind of basic research that can create whole new industries, just as basic research did a half century ago for radio and later television. Basic research is the fertilizer that nourishes all kinds of applied research and all kinds of new industries and new processes. We have to decide whether we want to abdicate this field of high energy physics as we are doing now.

Mr. Chairman, I was in Switzerland to see the CERN project with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SCHEUER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I became concerned that we were abdicating our leadership when I found many American scientists, high energy physicists, including an American Nobel Prize winner, working not for an American enterprise but for a European enterprise. That is a very serious brain drain. If that is what we want, if we want American scientists of the highest order of excellence to be going where the action is—and that may mean Switzerland to the CERN project or to another European consortium, or Japan which has made a national commitment to the field of high energy physics—so be it.

We can abdicate this field and let this brain drain continue, but I must say as an American I feel a sense of astonishment and shame that American scientists feel that they have to flee abroad and engage in work with our competitors to realize their own professional potential and to conduct cut-

ting edge research on high energy physics.

I say to my colleagues we have to make a decision as to whether to make this \$5 billion investment in basic research for all America. I come from New York State and we are not a competitor, but I am a total supporter of this project. It is in the national interest, and we should support it.

We are all concerned about costs and the impact on other areas of science. But we should remember that 75 percent of all Federal research goes to the military. The strategic defense initiative is projected to cost \$20 billion over 6 years. The superconducting super collider, in comparison, requires a commitment of \$5 billion over 10 years. We have to come to some value judgments on what is best for America, what is going to do the most for the American future in the field of high technology, which of these efforts is going to spawn new industries, new services, and a new emergence of America as a first-class industrial power. My vote is with the SSC, not SDI.

We want international participation, indeed we do, but foreign countries are not going to think about participating with us unless they know we are serious, unless they feel that they are participating with a team that will be first class. If we adopt this amendment, we are showing that we are not committed. We have already cut this budget 59 percent below the administration's request, and this amendment would cut it another substantial slice. Other countries are not going to think we are serious. Adopting this amendment would send the perfectly clear signal that we are not serious.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SCHEUER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SCHEUER. I think we have got to bite the bullet right now. We can abdicate the field and send the signal to American scientists that they better go abroad. If this mission to maintain our leadership in high energy physics is not a high priority goal, let us for goodness sake be honest with our scientific community and the world and say that we will get out of this competition and do something else. But I hope we do not do that.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER].

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, it is important at this point that we clarify the Frank Press statement.

Frank Press said that this project should be put on hold.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I met with Frank

Press a couple of weeks ago for a whole evening and my impression of our conversation was otherwise.

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that can be put in the RECORD, but what we have is that we need a new priority system and this project should be put on hold and that is the record.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. This is an excellent debate, but I also think that we need a new way to choose priorities for science in America and if this debate proceeds that new way, we will have done our job. Right now there are many reasons why this project should not go ahead with a \$1.6 billion authorization, but should be constrained to the Committee on Appropriations figure of \$100 million for research and development.

Mr. Chairman, the SSC is the wrong project for our times.

Last month, Dr. Frank Press, President of the National Academy of Sciences, urged us to set rational priorities for science funding, putting the superconducting super collider [SSC] in the category of projects which could be "reduced to maintenance funding." I concur with Dr. Press. But, more importantly, top industrial researchers also concur with Dr. Press. In its March 21 issue, *New Technology Week* reported on the responses which I received to my letter to the president of the Industrial Research Institute [IRI] regarding the SSC.

I asked the member companies of the IRI whether the SSC should be a priority project for this country. The response from the R&D directors was overwhelmingly negative: Only 4 of 24 responses believed that the SSC should be built now. The responses include the following:

"The argument that the technologies developed in the process of building the SSC will contribute to the overall strength of the U.S. . . . is patently unjustified."—Dr. C.K.N. Patel, executive director of research, Materials Science, Engineering and Academic Affairs Division, AT&T Bell Laboratories.

"[The] SSC appears to be a distortion of the nation's priorities. . . . High energy particle physics is certainly an intellectually stimulating field, but it is not more important than superconductivity, robotics, photonics, supercomputing or numerous other areas."—Richard Mateles, vice president of research for Stauffer Chemical Company.

"The potential for flowthrough of science from the SSC is not apparent. . . . I am most concerned about the potential for draining more scientists and engineers from the talent pool in a period when university output is diminishing."—Thomas Krotine, senior vice president, corporate research and development, The Sherwin-Williams Company.

"It is highly speculative whether the SSC will ultimately provide new information and understanding of particle physics that can be translated into benefits to industry and

the nation as a whole. . . ." Dr. J.J. Wise, vice president of research, Mobile Research and Development Corp.

The top researchers are on to something. It's clear that setting priorities for science means that the SSC should be shelved.

We are in a race for our technological lives, our competitive lives. This project goes back to the most basic of basic science, and it costs at least \$5 billion and probably more after overruns. It is so far removed from America's science and technology challenges of today and the next decade that it is just the wrong project.

The IRI members know this, and their statements reflect that they know the likely effects of paying for the SSC: A 6.63-percent cut across the board in all Department of Energy programs; a dramatic hampering of our ability to fund the revitalization of the Space Shuttle Program, the national aerospace plane, the space station, the doubling of the National Science Foundation budget, and a multi-hundred-million dollar clean coal demonstration program; and a delay in planned projects such as the human genome study and a \$10 billion renovation of this Nation's crumbling laboratory facilities.

There isn't enough money for all science programs, and the SSC can and should be put on the back burner. Both Dr. Press and Dr. Robert Rosenzweig of the Association of American Universities agree, and a recent Congressional Budget Office [CBO] report says the same, concluding that the SSC has scientific merit but is being undertaken "purely for knowledge." That isn't enough to justify the expenditure of \$600 million per year or more for the next 10 years.

As this debate shows, there is no consensus in America for this project. There is consensus in America for a space program. Those who advocate this project and have done so from the beginning have been the industry support group for the project. They have been those States who have been most interested in the benefits of the project. Outside of the high energy physics community, there is no consensus in the science community.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and any sign or manifestation of approval or disapproval is contrary to the rules of the House.

Mr. RITTER. The great majority of scientists who are not in the high energy physics community oppose the superconducting super collider. If a secret ballot were taken or if enough professors and research directors of corporate America, such as the IRI members, were interviewed, we would



discover that they are opposed to this project. There is not only no consensus for this project, there is staunch opposition through the length and breadth of American science against going forward with this SSC.

The amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER] is generous in that it gives \$100 million in the face of the budget cuts that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Miss SCHNEIDER] has mentioned.

The House Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee was just as generous when it approved \$100 million for SSC research and development this year. The report of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee expressed healthy skepticism about "initiating construction of [the SSC] in the face of budget reduction measures. \* \* \*

Even that \$100 million will hamper important initiatives in superconductivity, biotechnology, ceramics, and materials sciences, photonics, robotics, and manufacturing sciences. Those are the areas crucial to our jobs, our standard of living, our competitiveness, our trade balance, and our security. If we cut or eliminate funding in those fields, we'll fall behind our competitors. Programs in some of those very areas will suffer from the 6-percent across-the-board cut of DOE programs in the DOE bill which authorizes SSC funding.

The Appropriations Committee's decision to defer construction funding was also wise because it will allow the next administration to evaluate the project. The next administration will make the hard choice whether to fund the SSC at over \$600 million per year for the next 10 years for the SSC and \$270 million per year beyond that in operating expenses. That's another reason to defer funding for the SSC: Let the person who'll be most responsible have some input into the process.

Mr. Chairman, it's been said that the SSC would be a citadel for science. Mr. Chairman, that would serve the wrong purpose. If we would focus the best and the brightest of America's young minds in science on this project, we would be doing America a disservice because we would be taking them out of important applications-oriented fields such as electronics and photonics and semiconductors and superconductors, and putting them into high energy physics. America needs to win some Deming prizes.

□ 1150

We need to focus a little bit on the new Malcolm Baldrige Quality Award, the Deming Award, and the prizes in Japan for quality. That's the race we are in. We talk about competitiveness. The SSC has a negative effect on American competitiveness, because it drains areas of American science and technology which are so much more

important, which deserve such higher levels of priority.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] sought to point out, the SSC conflicts directly with every other major area of American science over the next several years and specific technology programs, such as clean coal technology, the space station, or the rehabilitation of the space shuttle itself. The fact is that we are way over budget. The SSC is going to cost us \$3 to \$4 billion over our budget limits.

The SSC is the wrong project at the wrong time, and the gentleman from Missouri presents us with an opportunity to prove that concept a little more. It gives \$100 million to do the R&D. It is a good amendment and a great deficit-cutting amendment.

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the DOE bill, and want to speak to the Transportation R&D section briefly. The Transportation, Aviation, and Materials Subcommittee, which I chair, placed a high funding priority on three key areas of engine and vehicle propulsion R&D. The purpose being to increase the fuel efficiency of our transportation system, and allow for a greater use of electricity and alternative fuels.

The first area of emphasis is advanced ceramics—the materials of engine components of the future. DOE's advanced materials program is helping to give U.S. ceramic producers a solid technology base and a number of advantages over their foreign counterparts. Over half of the \$54.8 million authorized in this section of the bill is dedicated to some form of ceramics R&D. This work includes developing parts for an all-ceramic advanced gas turbine automobile engine, testing and processing of promising materials, and procuring specialized equipment for the world renowned High Temperature Materials Laboratory in Oak Ridge, TN.

The second area of emphasis is related to car and truck emissions. In a year when Congress may enact stricter clean air standards on mobile sources of nitrogen oxides and hydrocarbons, the Science Committee has expanded the Alternative Fuels and Heavy Duty Transport R&D Programs to emphasize investigations on how to make truck and bus engines burn fuel in a cleaner way.

The third area is the Electric Vehicles R&D Program, which is another ongoing initiative related to clean air standards. Here we have placed a great deal of emphasis on advanced battery development, since the future of electric vehicles is tentative at best without batteries that power a car 100 miles or more.

Mr. Chairman, the funding for transportation R&D does represent an increase over the administration's request. However, these relatively modest programs are producing significant results. I would like to thank my colleague from Florida, Tom LEWIS, for his consistent and dedicated effort on the subcommittee in developing our recommendations in this important area. I commend Chairman ROE and Mr. LUJAN for their efforts to bring this bill to the floor quickly. I urge the support of my colleagues.

In addition to the transportation programs, I voice my strong support for the oil and natural gas-related research funding contained in the bill. The Enhanced Oil Recovery Research Program, for example, is helping to develop techniques and models to extend the life of old oil wells known as stripper wells. This work will directly benefit the small independent oil producers who do not have the economic resources or the vast reserves of the big multinational companies. Many of our Nation's universities, including the University of Oklahoma, are involved in these investigations, and I am confident that this bill will continue a strong research relationship with these universities.

With respect to the superconductor super collider, I would have preferred that no funding be made available for construction of the SSC until we have a better understanding of the magnet design and greater knowledge of the potential of superconducting materials. I am also concerned that the price tag on the SSC over the next few years will force us to make painful reductions in our other science priorities.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCURDY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I might add I would like to just quote from a few people in industry who are not part of the industry support group for the SSC and what they have said. Dr. C.K.N. Patel, executive director of research, materials science, for AT&T Bell Laboratories, says:

The argument that the technologies developed in the process of building the SSC will contribute to the overall strength of the U.S. is patently unjustified.

Here is a senior vice-president, Thomas Krotine, from the Sherwin-Williams Co.:

The potential for flowthrough of science from the SSC is not apparent. I am most concerned about the potential for draining more scientists and engineers from the talent pool in a period when university output is diminishing.

Dr. J.J. Wise, vice president of research, Mobil Research & Development Co., says:

It is highly speculative whether the SSC will ultimately provide new information and understanding of particle physics that can be translated into benefits to industry and the nation as a whole.

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I would urge the gentleman to submit those statements for the RECORD.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I include a copy of the statements for the RECORD:

"The argument that the technologies developed in the process of building the SSC will contribute to the overall strength of the U.S. . . . is patently unjustified."—Dr. C.K.N. Patel, executive director of research, Materials Science, Engineering and Academic Affairs Division, AT&T Bell Laboratories.

"[The] SSC appears to be a distortion of the nation's priorities . . . High energy particle physics is certainly and intellectually stimulating field, but it is not more important than superconductivity, robotics, photonics, supercomputing or numerous other areas."—Richard Mateles, vice president of research for Stauffer Chemical Company.

"The potential for flowthrough of science from the SSC is not apparent . . . I am most concerned about the potential for draining more scientists and engineers from the talent pool in a period when university output is diminishing."—Thomas Krotine, senior vice president, corporate research and development, The Sherwin-Williams Company.

"It is highly speculative whether the SSC will ultimately provide new information and understanding of particle physics that can be translated into benefits to industry and the nation as a whole . . ."—Dr. J.J. Wise, vice president of research, Mobil Research and Development Corp.

"The SSC should be postponed by several years and short-term emphasis be placed on programs that address the productivity of the U.S. manufacturing base."—Patrick Carroll, director of corporate R&D, Machinery & Defense Operations, FMC Corp.

"[The] SSC should be delayed until we sort out the priority programs that bear on the very survival of our country. Until we fund those programs adequately, there is no room for [the] SSC."—Dr. John Dempsey, vice president of science and technology, Bemis Company Inc.

"It seems our nation needs to reassess our mechanisms for priority setting in the total R&D budget process . . . [A] position [against] the SSC is very appropriate."—I.G. Snyder, vice president, Dow U.S.A., director of applied R&D, Dow Chemical Company.

"The area of particle physics research is requiring increasingly greater expenditures for more difficult explorations with diminishing returns."—Dr. Chester Szymanski, corporate vice president for research and development, National Starch & Chemical Corp.

"The price tag [for SSC] is unconscionably high . . . It is difficult for me to understand how the SSC could rank on a national priority list that includes biomedical research, superconductivity, photonics, high density semiconductor integration and interconnection, structural composites, fossil fuel recovery, alternative sources of energy, factory automation, etc."—D.B. Rogers, general director of research and development, Dupont Electronics.

Others coming out against the SSC include:

Walter Robb, senior vice president of corporate research and development with the General Electric Company;

F.B. Sprow, vice president of corporate research, Exxon Research and Engineering Company;

Dr. Grady Harris, vice president of research and development, the Hollister Co., (Libertyville, Ill.).

The four members of IRI that came out in favor of the SSC:

Warren Offutt, vice president technical management, Eaton Corp.

Robert Calcaterra, director of R&D and quality assurance, Adolf Coors & Co.

Robert Stratton, director, Central Research Labs, Texas Instruments.

Florence Metz, general manager of new ventures, Inland Steel Co.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCURDY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, it astounds me that some vice president of the Sherwin-Williams Co., or somebody working over here on the McDonnell Co., or somebody over here is going to be determining the policy of America. It seems to me we can get 50 million names listed of people who are in favor of space and technology in this country, and it seems to me that two or three names here, because this person may not think it is right, that is not how America works. I suggest that I do not think that reasoning is valid at all.

Mr. McCURDY. Reclaiming my time, I think it is important in concluding with the short time that I have to reiterate the points I made earlier, and that is we have only a finite amount of funding for science in this country, and if as we on the committee would like to see greater increases in the future for science, if that does in fact occur, then perhaps we could include the SSC as one of those high-priority items, but history has shown, and our experience has also shown, that we have not had that excess funding. We have not had those increases. My belief is that the best bet for our future is to invest in those areas where we have the most competitive payoff in the short term, and that is in the areas mentioned previously, and I again urge support and adoption of the Buechner amendment.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, and I want to say at this time I certainly admire and want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], the chairman, and certainly the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN], the ranking member, for their work which they have done on this project. It has been a long-term commitment and a long-term work. I also have some respect for the gentleman from Missouri, but I want to point out that what the gentleman from Missouri is talking about

is commitment, long-term commitment and leadership in this Nation, commitment to say yes, we are going to do something, we are going to conceive an idea, and we are going to do it, and we are going to do it over a number of years, not from year to year to year to year.

Certainly in many issues that we have had before this House we have seen commitment today and faltering tomorrow. I suggest that the gentleman from Missouri sets up a scenario, yes, he sets up a scenario that we could have another Clinch River if we do not make that long-term commitment; then we fall apart in those commitments, because things change from year to year.

I want to talk about some other issues. We talk about this cutting out research and small science, and there have been challenges about what the superconductors have done and the high-energy research has done in this country over the last several years. Let me suggest that superconductivity itself is the result of the high-energy research, that magnetic resonance imaging is a direct result of research that has been done, microjet technology, cancer research in my very own district that is going on at a high-energy research facility, and that is going on because we have taken the time 20 years ago to make a commitment to high-energy research at Fermi Lab, television, x rays, VCR's, on and on and on. As a matter of fact, 30 percent, it has been suggested, of our gross national product today, the research is the commitment that we made 20-some years ago to high-energy research. Why should we strangle that gift that we have developed in this country, the gift of technology and understanding and wisdom?

I also suggest that if we make that commitment, and it has been talked about here today, if we do not make that commitment in putting those construction dollars down, we are never going to get the 25-percent funding and matching funding from other countries across the world. We need to make that commitment. We need to put those dollars down before those other nations, whether it be Japan or Western Europe, put their dollars down.

Let me also suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that, yes, it is a brain drain in this country. It is a brain drain because if we do not make that commitment, if we do not make that commitment we will lose the best high-energy physics scientists that we have in this Nation and that are here studying in this Nation, and they are going to be in CERN and the Soviet Union and Japan, because we do not have the facilities to offer them.

If we want to make a commitment to this Nation, if we want to make a long-



term commitment, and, yes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania made some reference, there are some people who have certainly an interest in this, because it might be near their district, and certainly said that about the other gentleman from Illinois, and I guess we do that in this Congress once in awhile. But let me also suggest that we believe what is right for this country, and we need to make this commitment. We need to make that long-term commitment, and I certainly would urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

□ 1200

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding so that I may point out that when he talked about the small sciences being hurt because of this project, we should look back and look at history in regard to Fermi, which is really the superconducting super collider No. 1. We have now, after Fermi, found that high energy physics in toto is less in percentage in comparison to other sciences than it was before, and yet that same accusation was made when Fermi was being considered, that it would have the effect of crowding out other sciences as well. I can give one example with Fermi and it has been just the opposite. High energy physics in percentage totals has gone down in comparison to other sciences, so we ought to look at history.

Mr. HASTERT. I agree with the gentleman. Certainly on this floor some 20 years ago this same argument was being made, saying that putting this money in high energy research at Fermi Lab, or wherever that commitment would be, and at that same time there were other States involved, was a terrible thing and it was going to crowd out science, it was going to be doomsday for discovery in this country, and that that has happened is not so.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I will speak very briefly.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment that seeks to reduce the funding for the superconducting super collider below the \$147 million figure called for in the bill. Such a reduction would be inconsistent with action previously taken by the House and threatens the timetable established for development of this ambitious and badly needed scientific research project.

Just last week the House approved the fiscal year 1989 budget conference report. In that report, House and Senate conferees agreed to a level of \$150 million for fiscal year 1989 for the superconducting super collider.

That was a compromise figure reached by splitting the difference between the \$200 million that was contained in the Senate budget resolution and the \$100 million contained in the House budget resolution. The language that was agreed upon in the conference report and approved by the House on May 26, just last week, is simple and straightforward, and I would like to read directly from the report. It says: " \* \* \* The conferees assume a split between the House and the Senate assumed levels of funding for the Department of Energy's superconducting super collider project." It is hard to be any clearer than that.

The \$147 million for SSC funding provided in this bill is in keeping with the intent of the Budget Committee and is consistent with the direction provided in the budget conference report last week.

The energy and water appropriations bill came to the floor before the conference report on the budget, and it is certainly possible that the conferees on the appropriations measure will increase the \$100 million funding provided in that bill.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to retain world leadership in scientific and technological advancement, if we plan to compete with other nations in a worldwide marketplace into the 21st century, we cannot shrink from the type of commitment to pure scientific research that the SSC represents.

I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take my whole 5 minutes because I know the clock is running, and I appreciate the Chairman's earlier remarks.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation is only spending three-tenths of 1 percent on civilian research, so the question here today is not the advanced dollars talking about the super collider. Whether it is \$4 or \$5 billion is really a bit irrelevant when we look at the lack of research commitment that this Nation is making to civilian research.

The concern I have for this amendment really, which I think is counterproductive, is the striking of the out-years in terms of authorization. The House has committed to the super collider and the \$100 million, there is no question about it, it is in there and it is over in the Senate. But I think my point that I really want to make today is that this is not a State project. This is a national project and an international project. It will give us the world leadership and the preeminence in science.

So I think those of my colleagues who are from would-be States or States that do not have the proposal before the Department of Energy, that is somewhat irrelevant. It is nice

to have the project and it will produce some jobs, but I think we ought to make the point, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN] said earlier, that this is an international, world leadership role for this Nation. And this Nation and the next President and the next Congress will make a policy decision on the expansion of the science budget within the science budget from the Department of Energy to DOD, to the Appropriations Committee on science and technology.

So we have a major policy decision ahead of us in the next year to expand the science research programs three-tenths of 1 percent out of a \$1 trillion budget. We are really talking about a low priority nationally in respect to the future of science for fusion or solar energy and for other important advancements.

So I congratulate the committee, both the majority and the minority side, and oppose this amendment. I think it is a counterproductive amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHLERT: Page 9, line 16, through page 10, line 12 amend subsection (2) to read as follows:

(2) FOREIGN PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary shall not expend any funds authorized under subsection (1)(d), until the Secretary receives commitments of foreign participation totaling not less than 25 percent of the total estimated cost of the superconducting super collider project.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to make one thing very clear, as I start, I am for the superconducting super collider. I want the project to go forward because I recognize it is a major scientific initiative. But I want it to go forward in a manner that is reasonable, prudent, and most of all fair.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require that foreign nations commit to paying at least 25 percent of the cost of the superconducting super collider [SSC] before construction could begin.

The amendment is designed to solve two problems.

The first is that we simply do not have the money to build the project right now. That's not just my conclusion. The entire House has expressed that view by voting repeatedly to reject administration requests for construction funding in the Department of Energy [DOE] appropriation. If this project is to move forward, and I want it to move forward, another source of funding must be tapped.

Other nations would be a logical source of funding, though, even if we were not facing budget constraints. It's the only way to prevent them from getting a "free ride" on America's investment.

How often do we come to this floor to complain that other nations take advantage of us—that we pay a disproportionate share of their defense costs, that we end up subsidizing their companies with our basic research? Well, here we finally have a chance to legislate some "burden sharing" requirements proactively—to put their money where our mouths are.

Scientists from all over the world will use the SSC and all research results will be publicly available. This is not going to be a hush-hush, code word, highly classified endeavor. A project with such international benefits ought to have international financing. They want to share the benefits—and they will. Then how about sharing the burden. They should.

In fact, there isn't much dispute about the desirability of international cost-sharing. Even H.R. 4505 sets 25 percent cost sharing as a goal, although the bill betrays its ambivalence about foreign participation by placing a ceiling on contributions from abroad. Dr. Frank Press, the President of the National Academy of Sciences feels no such ambivalence; he says we should encourage foreign cost-sharing.

No, the real issue is how best to encourage those contributions. And if we're honest, the situation is clear. Absent this amendment, other nations have no real incentive to contribute.

We once asked a DOE official why foreign governments would pay money toward construction of the SSC. The official replied that their only incentive was the fear that the machine would not be built without their contributions. What better way to attract foreign money, then, than to state in black and white that that fear is well placed.

Without this amendment, we have a textbook case of the "free rider" problem. It doesn't pay for anyone to be the first to ante up because they might be able to benefit from the project without doing so.

Science policy experts have acknowledged this problem. Dr. Roland Schmitt, the Chairman of the National Science Board, for example, has endorsed this amendment.

Opponents of this amendment bring up a series of criticisms that only highlight their unrealistic assumptions.

For example, I've heard it said that the cost-sharing requirement will make prospects for the project more uncertain. Just how much more uncertain could the SSC be? We're talking about a project that is on "life support" right now, with its congressional "doctors" too queasy to pull the plug

and too uncommitted to bring it back to health. It's not possible to be in a more precarious state.

This amendment would actually add stability by making it far more likely to attract foreign funds. In addition, cost sharing would make it more difficult to kill the project mid-stream because doing so would involve abrogating agreements with other governments. And the Congress has killed particle machines after work has begun in the past.

In short, the amendment doesn't give foreign nations any more "veto power" over the project than they have already. It does make it less likely that they'll use that veto power by default, by simply hoping that the United States will be happy to underwrite their science as it always has in the past.

We also hear an undercurrent of concern that this amendment gives foreign governments some additional bargaining power to make demands on American planners. It's never stated what nefarious demands are in mind. Truly, when it comes to seeking foreign contributions, "we have nothing to fear, but fear itself."

Finally, in a last ditch effort, opponents say we can't have these kinds of cost-sharing requirements because we never have had them before. So much for progress.

We've never been in this situation before. We've never had so many "big science" projects competing for funds at the same time we have a record debt and when we have allies who are healthy enough to pay for equipment they will want to use.

In an era when we watch our cowboy movies on Japanese TV's, it's foolish to try to play the Lone Ranger. Anachronistic attitudes will be the downfall of this project.

Einstein once noted how much thought often lagged behind technology. He said the atomic bomb had changed everything but the way men think.

Mr. Chairman, big science is a new kind of science just as surely as the atomic bomb was a new kind of weapon. And like the bomb, it necessitates a new kind of politics, the politics of cooperation.

If we don't cooperate, the SSC will have the same impact on our budget that the atomic bomb will have on our planet. Its costs mushrooming, the SSC will scorch its neighboring budgets in Function 250 immediately, and then will slowly debilitate the rest of the budget over a period of years.

This amendment prevents that calamity without harming the project in any way. Its goal is simply to make the SSC an affordable project to which all the beneficiaries contribute.

If you're for the SSC, if you're for keeping all of American science healthy, if you're for making our allies

pay a fair share of international projects, I think you have to vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHLERT was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1215

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of the superconducting super collider project and commend the leadership of the committee for including the project in its energy authorization bill.

However, regardless of how any of my colleagues feel about the pros or cons of the SSC, I believe the Boehlert amendment makes sense and is worthy of their support.

The amendment before us today simply requires the Secretary of Energy to receive foreign commitments of 25 percent of the estimated total cost of the SSC project before construction money is spent. Without this amendment I am afraid the SSC may never be completed.

The bottom line on this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is that by reducing the cost of the SSC project by over \$1 billion by requiring foreign participation, Congress increases the probability that the SSC will actually be completed.

The SSC is an ambitious science project by anybody's standards. I do not need to remind my colleagues of the difficulties in funding other non-defense programs in order to properly support reestablishing American leadership in science and technology. Others in Congress fear that the many small science projects funded by Congress are threatened by the amount of science dollars soaked up by the SSC. Over time these pressures will increase, threatening congressional support for the SSC in future years. This amendment relieves some of those pressures.

Mr. Chairman, if this country is serious about international participation, now is the time to secure foreign commitments. The bill before us at this time merely requires the Secretary of Energy to seek foreign participation and then report to Congress on the results of his efforts. I do not doubt that the authors of the provision as written in the bill fully intend the Secretary of Energy to acquire such participation, but they are going about it all wrong. If we wait until the decision has already been made by this country to go ahead unilaterally to build the SSC no matter what the level of for-



eign contributions, we lose any negotiating leverage we ever had in getting those commitments. Other nations will then be afforded the luxury of selectively choosing how, when, and if they are actually going to contribute, confident their scientists will be given equal opportunity to participate in the experiments once the SSC is completed. It's time this country stopped giving other nations a free ride on the American taxpayer.

It should also be evident that this is in no way a killer amendment for the SSC project. Testimony before the Science, Space, and Technology Committee and the House Appropriations Committee by Department of Energy officials indicated that Congress might reasonably expect up to 40 to 50 percent of the project's costs to be forthcoming from foreign participants. This amendment only requires half of that amount be committed before beginning construction of the SSC. This amendment, therefore, is not an attempt to establish conditions impossible to satisfy, but rather to set realistic goals for international participation.

This amendment welcomes the opportunity for international cooperation and does not limit its investment. It is not guilty of scientific protectionism, but rather seeks to increase the burden sharing of this big-science project. Even in the area of national defense, Congress has seen the wisdom of asking others with an ability to contribute to share the costs of their own security. It doesn't make sense for us to pay for the defense of other nations. The same is true with respect to the SSC. We shouldn't pay for someone else's science budget. We should adopt this amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROE as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BOEHLERT: Strike the matter to be inserted and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) FOREIGN PARTICIPATION.—(a) The Secretary shall seek to obtain commitments for foreign participation in the Superconducting Super Collider project at a level not less than 25 per centum nor more than 33½ per centum of the total estimated cost of the project as determined at the time of final site selection."

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the substitute amendment.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. Chairman, the reason we are offering this substitute for the Boehlert language is because I think that basically in this country we do not want

Japan or Germany or anybody else from the Soviet Union to determine when or whether we do or do not build the super collider.

We are trying to come to an accord on this issue and it is the consensus, the overwhelming consensus of the committee and I hope the House of Representatives, that, yes, we do want foreign participation where there are these big science issues involved. America can no longer build it alone, we cannot build the space station alone which is why we are negotiating with Japan and Canada and the other countries to participate.

However, we could make a very, very serious error if we allow the foreign interests to have anymore than 33½ percent. Our concern about that is that they can come back and say, "We will give you a credit offset from Japan and we will build the magnets." The magnets are probably the most important scientific and technological part of the whole program. Or the Italians will come back and say that issue.

I do not believe that America is ready to give away high technology to other countries with all kinds of regulations and laws that require us not to be able to transfer our technology and so forth.

So I am trying to work now with the gentleman from New York in saying we would go to the 25 percent but put a limit, he cannot exceed 33½ percent.

Now the question arises as to whether or not the Secretary should have a right to say something about that. Should we sit back and wait until there is a definitive 25 percent before the Congress of the United States could make a decision and move this program? I say that is the wrong way to go, we should not be doing it that way. I say that we have provisions in the bill that provide for reports coming back to the Congress, back to this committee to determine what level, if any level, that the foreign participation would be.

But certainly we do not want to give either Japan, Germany or any other country the right to tell us we cannot proceed if that is the will of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] press his reservation of the point of order?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. No, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

First, Mr. Chairman, let me congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] for the thoughtfulness that he has put into this subject. I, too, believe that we ought to have foreign participation. I do not think there is anyone in this whole Congress and perhaps in this whole country that does not believe that we

ought to have some sort of foreign participation. These projects are getting so big that that is the only way that we are able to do more than one at a time.

That is what we are doing with the space station as a matter of fact. We have about 25-percent participation with foreign countries because they will benefit from that.

There is something that bothers me, however, about the amendment as proposed by the gentleman from New York. We do not have control of all of the spinoffs that come from this technology. They would go to other countries. That is one of the things that if they got control of it, who is going to control the technology, who is going to control the spinoffs? And, after all, that is what we are in this for.

The second thing that bothers me is that we really, then, under the wording of the amendment by the gentleman from New York, under that wording we do not have the right to determine if we go forward with the project or not. It leaves the decision to foreign countries.

If they decide, if they get together and say, "We are not going to participate because we want to build it in Italy, we want to build it in Japan or in the Soviet Union," wherever they want to build it, they just could withhold their participation so that we do not get 25-percent participation and we cannot build it.

So we are leaving ourselves wide open for decision by others; we cannot control our own destiny. Therefore, I think that the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], the chairman of the committee, still says that we want their participation, at least 25 percent participation, but we do not want the control to go to the other countries. And that is why the other limitation of 33 percent is there. I think that is a good substitute and I would urge its adoption.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute. The SSC is an investment in our future but it is also, and we want it to be, a U.S. enterprise fully under the control of U.S. management. It certainly is in the best interests of the United States to reassert our leadership in fundamental science, to maintain this control. This would give us the option to allow us to have the foreign participation in the program under our control and this way it would not deter the construction schedule.

I urge my colleagues to support the substitute.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for the flag-waving right now. We are seeking evidence of that right now.

Look, burden-sharing has been one of the topics of heated debate in this Congress from the beginning to the present right now. It is suggested by those who are advocating the substitute amendment that somehow we are going to put in the hands of questionable foreign characters the direction of this important scientific initiative. That simply is not so.

Let me tell you who is for this burden-sharing, let me tell you who is realistic in assessing this whole situation.

The Chairman of the National Science Board, Dr. Roland Schmitt says:

Should Congress decide to proceed with funding the SSC, it should ask that at least 25 percent of the cost be obtained from foreign countries who will also benefit from the scientific advances flowing from the SSC.

What does Dr. Robert Rosenzweig, of the Association of American Universities say? He says:

The scientific justification for constructing the SSC is clear and compelling; the practical justification for going forward would be greatly strengthened if the burden of paying for it were more widely shared. There is no doubt that the SSC should be financed in cooperation with other nations whose scientists will use it and whose people will benefit from the knowledge of the universe that it will disclose.

Then we go on to Dr. Frank Press of the National Academy of Sciences. Now these are important people in American scientific policy. Dr. Press says to me in a letter:

I certainly agree with your premise that we should encourage foreign participation in large-scale projects of this sort. Increasingly in the coming years, both the financial and the intellectual resources required for major scientific endeavors will have to be international. The challenge, I think, is to find mechanisms that encourage (and perhaps even require) international participation while still signaling the intention of this country to proceed with this important scientific program.

Now I want to proceed with this superconducting super collider because I recognize that it is a major scientific initiative for the United States of America. But I am also a realist and I know that foreign scientists are going to beat a path to our door because they are going to want to use this great facility. They will be able to use it. If they want to have some of the benefit, how about sharing some of the burden? Burden-sharing is a concept that this Congress embraces. We tell it to our allies in NATO when we are talking about defending the Atlantic Alliance; we are talking about it to the Japanese, our good friends over the Pacific, about picking up a greater share of their defense burden. How about international scientific cooperation? How about all those other scientists, the Germans, the English, all

over the world who are going to use this project financed by American taxpayers? How about asking their governments to ante up a modest share?

The President of the National Academy of Sciences says it makes sense, the Chairman of the National Science Board says it makes sense, the head of the American Association of Universities says it makes sense and I say it makes sense and, guess what, the American people are going to say it makes sense.

The most costly scientific project in the history of this great Republic, why not have some of those who are going to benefit cough up some of the dough so that they can relieve the American taxpayers and we can go forward with this major scientific initiative?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, let me say that the Roe substitute amendment makes about as much sense as voluntary taxes. If this House of Representatives passed legislation enacting a voluntary tax that the American people could decide whether or not they want to pay, the Treasury would not collect a dime in additional revenue. And that is exactly what the Roe substitute amendment does on this issue. It says, "The Secretary shall seek to obtain commitments for foreign participation for the SSC for not less than 25 percent nor more than 33 1/3 percent." There are no teeth in the Roe substitute amendment. It means that the foreign governments that we are going to ask to contribute to the SSC can tell the United States to go fly a kite and we are going to go ahead and build it all on the back of the American taxpayer and not have any mandatory foreign participation.

□ 1230

On the other hand, the Boehlert amendment says that no funds shall be expended until 25 percent of the cost of operating the SSC comes from foreign sources. That has got teeth in it, and that is going to force the foreign dollars to come in to reduce the cost of this project to the American taxpayer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHLERT was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, there have been a number of red herrings that have been put forward by those who oppose the Boehlert amendment and support the Roe substitute, and every one of those is fallacious.

For example, we have heard the argument that the adoption of the Boehlert amendment will allow foreign countries to determine U.S. science policy. That is absolutely not true. The Congress of the United States is determining U.S. science policy today, and the question on this amendment is whether we wish to internationalize the cost of the SSC or not, and that determination is going to be made today by the Members of this body if the Boehlert amendment is adopted and the Roe amendment is rejected, and it will be made by nobody else.

We have heard the argument that the Boehlert amendment will decrease the competitiveness of American industries by increasing international participation. That is an absolutely false argument because section 107(4) of the bill limits foreign manufacture to a third of the major systems or components as so, therefore, American industry is guaranteed at least two-thirds of all the high-tech components.

Finally, we hear the implication that the Boehlert amendment in the section I have just referred to is incompatible. That is not true either. The Boehlert amendment merely means that not all foreign contributions will be able to go high tech systems or components, and that is only fair. If the United States is going to pay for digging tunnels and other nonglamorous expenses, so should others, if they are going to reap the scientific benefits. So what this is going to mean, if the Boehlert amendment is adopted, is that the Japanese or Europeans or anybody else cannot simply come in and offer to do the high tech stuff and pay for it while our taxpayers end up paying for digging the tunnels and pouring the concrete. They are going to share the entire cost of all these components and all of the costs of the construction of the SSC on an equal and fair basis.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New York for introducing his amendment. I think that the Roe substitute makes absolutely no sense at all if we wish to force foreign governments into making contributions.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for his contribution, and I would like to point out that we thought so much in this Congress and in this committee particularly about the importance of international scientific cooperation that we created a subcommittee with that very title, a Subcommittee on International Scientific Cooperation.

I see my distinguished chairman standing there, and I am proud to serve on that subcommittee, because international scientific cooperation is extremely important.



Now, let us not worry about all these claims that if we have international cooperation, everything is going to fall apart.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has expired.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to object, and I reserve the right to object. I will not object if the gentleman will yield to me during some of the time. Otherwise we are going to be here on this for another hour.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my chairman and to my colleagues in the House that when we are talking about international scientific cooperation, we already have it with the space station. We have been talking about the Mars exploration. The President of the United States has just visited the Kremlin, and he has been dealing with the General Secretary of the U.S.S.R. They have talked about United States-Soviet international cooperation. So we talk about international cooperation, and we have burden-sharing all the time, and that makes sense.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to wait for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] and I will ask him to yield.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to yield. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] ask the gentleman from New York to yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. No, Mr. Chairman, I was waiting for the gentleman to yield back the balance of his time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield back the balance of my time after I make this point. Burden-sharing makes sense. It makes sense for this project, it makes sense for the American people, and most of all, it makes sense for the taxpayers because we all know that the international community is going to use this project, and if they do, I say, how about having them pay some of the costs of the construction of this project?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, let me say this:

Alas that youth should vanish like the rose, that life's sweet-scented manuscript should close.

Fantasy, fantasy, fantasy.

No. 1, this chairman was the one who devised the International Subcommittee to be placed in the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. That is No. 1. This chairman wrote the language that curtailed foreign participation so that our high technology could not be diverted from the United States. This chairman wrote that particular language which our people are saying is good language, and I am pleased with that.

Nobody is telling the American people to go fly a kite, or that this program is being put on the back of the American taxpayer. That fundamentally is not so. If the superconducting super collider is worth building at all—and I visited CERN and talked to all their executives and representatives from 13 different countries who are participating in that program—the economic benefit from this program in Europe alone is an economic benefit ratio of 5 to 1. So everybody is in favor of the superconducting super collider.

But maybe the distinguished gentleman from New York is forgetting something. We wrote into this bill that, yes, they can participate and should participate, but we gave latitude to the Secretary to make those determinations and to report back to the Congress to make the final decisions that would have to be made.

Did the gentleman consider the point of view that, suppose we decided not to have anybody participate from another country, and suppose that Illinois or Texas or Arizona or one of the other States in our Nation decided they would put up the money, the balance of the money. As it is now, we have this cockamammy program where, when the time is ripe, we say, "What is in the envelope, please?" That will come to the Department of Energy, and he will open up the envelope, and that is what the State is going to participate in. Yet we can go to foreign countries and say, "If you put up \$2 or \$3 billion, you get part of the cream of the crop." But we deny the States to do that.

I say to the Members that what we have done is provide the latitude here, and we have stuck right to what we said. We do not want them to get more

than 33½ percent, and I am totally in favor of foreign participation. But I am not going to deny that State the right to put up additional funds if they want to.

Let me point out what the language says. The language here says that the Secretary shall not expend any funds authorized under section 1 and (d) until the Secretary receives commitments of foreign participation totaling not less than 25 percent. But suppose the Secretary decides that either Illinois or Texas or Arizona or Tennessee is an eligible State, and they say, "We are ready to negotiate if you are ready to go ahead, but we don't have the 25 percent." Then I have got to wait, but suppose I am from Texas and I will put up the other billion and a half dollars because I do not want to delay for 10 years.

So from my point of view, the gentleman is right on participation, but I think we have made a reasonable point here, and I think we should reserve the right to ourselves. And it is not flag-waving, but let me say that even if it were flag-waving, then I am going to wave that flag from this end of the Capitol to the other end of the Capitol, and God save the queen. But I say that we have given the flexibility, and we want the foreign participation, but we do not want foreign participation to dominate. I think this is fair and just to the States that are involved.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I will reclaim the balance of my time, and I would like to say that I totally agree with the distinguished chairman of the committee. I even agree with the gentleman from New York in that we want some participation. We made visits to CERN and DESY seeking participation. We took people from Commerce, Defense, and other areas to do the talking, and as the gentleman from Wisconsin well knows, when he talks about percentage of participation from foreign sources for the space station, that was voluntary. This should be voluntary.

The substitute that the committee chairman has given us gives us the option. We can take the participation. Surely, as the gentleman from New York remembers, the administration came before the International Subcommittee and testified that they did not favor a mandated Federal foreign participation, that they were fearful that it would do just exactly what this chairman pointed out.

I am for foreign participation. I want it, but let me tell the Members the fear that I have. In going over there and visiting where it is almost totally world coordinated foreign participation, particularly at CERN, I went down into the main collision chamber and we took folks with us.

We did a documentary there that is available now.

□ 1240

Not one time did I walk through a metal detector. I am not really sure that we can operate like that.

Scientists can transcend national boundaries. They think probably on a higher level than we do, but we have to think practically, and I would like to allow foreign participation in the form of using our operation and using our equipment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SMITH of Florida). The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALL of Texas was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HALL of Texas. For international participation it is so complex, if we get it to 24½ percent, and then we are held up. The U.S. commitment has to come first. It is a poor negotiating tactic. It is a lever for the SSC opponents. It can cost us U.S. jobs, and we cannot construct until we get the 25 percent.

Please, we cannot live with that. Let us take the 25 percent, if we can get it, let us take it on our terms.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] and I would simply point out that there are some very, very serious flaws to the original amendment as proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT]. It is those flaws that led the committee to reject the amendment despite the surface attraction and the surface appeal it has.

Yes, we do get frustrated about the lack of equal burden-sharing particularly among our Western NATO allies and the defense issues, and we have all expressed our concerns on that in the series of votes just several weeks ago. And, yes, some of that does extend into the scientific infrastructure projects.

But the problem of the gentleman's amendment; that is to say the gentleman from New York, is that really holds our scientists hostage to the actions of foreign governments. Mr. Chairman, I do not like hostages. I do not like it when Americans are held hostage in Iran. I do not like it when Americans are held hostage in Lebanon. And I am certainly not going to vote to hold the American scientific community hostage to the Mitsubishi cartel. It does not make sense.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the letters that the gentleman read to us from Dr. Press and others say this, and note what they say is opposed to what the gentleman's amendment does. Should Congress decide, then we should seek foreign participation. Every avenue

ought to be explored, yes, but what his amendment does is says foreign participation has to be guaranteed before Congress decides.

Mr. Chairman, we have the cart before the horse.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and several extensions. I would like to finish my remarks.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY] let me clarify a point?

Mr. HENRY. Fine, Mr. Chairman; I'd be pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, the letter from Ronald Schmitt, the Chairman of the National Science Board, says that should Congress decide to proceed with funding the SSC, with funding the SSC, it should ask that at least 25 percent of the cost be obtained from foreign countries who will benefit from the scientific advances flowing from the SSC, not should we seek international funding. Should we decide to proceed with the project, we should go with the 25-percent minimum.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] but he does not say we should hold back funding contingent on such a match, although that is clearly something to be noted, if that is Press' letter, and the gentleman has read several. He also said that the challenge to this Congress, and I agree with the challenge, is to find mechanisms while, and I quote the letter, "still proceeding."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment prevents us from proceeding and has the inadvertent effect then of allowing our potential international competitors in the scientific community to hold us in check until they perhaps are in a position to more advantageously attack the project then ourselves and thereby potentially sacrificing our superiority in this branch of science. I just do not think we should get ourselves in a situation where we hold our scientific community hostage to the actions of another nation and then say that we will do nothing to seek their release until the nations holding them hostage give us permission to do it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I also would like to rise in support of the distinguished chairman's substitute amendment and in opposition to the gentleman from New York's amendment. I think, if we mandate a certain percentage of foreign participation, that does tend to tie our hands. I think the chairman's substi-

tute where we set a target that we encourage the Secretary of Energy to seek a certain level of participation, that is much more flexible. It achieves the same purpose. It sets a policy of the Congress, a sense of the Congress, that we need foreign participation and that we want a minimum of 25 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I would also just like to point out that since some States think that Texas is a foreign nation in a sense, if this amendment were to pass, it would tend to favor it being selected in Texas since Texas has offered to fund \$1 billion of the project.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the substitute. I just rise briefly to say that I have to say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] is one of our finer Members, and I agree with him most of the time, and I agree with him also at this time.

But, Mr. Chairman, I believe, if we look at our activities with the space station, the 25-percent commitment was no problem from Canada, Europe, Japan. And if we are to pass the gentleman's language, many of the participatory areas of the super collider would come late in the program, and before construction could start we might be held hostage to that lateness where they would be looking for their own participation.

Second of all, could my colleagues imagine the scenario where we might have 22- or 23-percent participation and some nation says, "Well, look. We'll go along with you and come up with additional money, but here's what we want."

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the substitute is not bad for this reason, and I philosophically am in line with the gentleman's thinking. I do not think there is anybody that rises more for buy American, and I will be rising later today, shortly, for a buy American amendment.

So, Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and I think that he is doing a great job, but I think that the substitute gives us that leeway, and more importantly it gives the States an opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, some States may want to kick up and come up with some additional money here. I think that makes a lot of sense. It gives more of this project to America, and I am more concerned about what are the benefits to America, and I think that we offer that, and I do not think it is really a bad situation.



Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that earlier in debate we had two chairmen talking. We had the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Scientific Cooperation. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] says that we are at the mercy of foreign nations because they might not want to contribute, and the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] says that we are at the mercy of foreign nations because they dominate the funding of the project.

I mean which is the right answer to this whole thing?

Now the point of the matter is that we have had before our committee expert testimony from the administration which said that it has visited the foreign capitals around the world, and they are excited about this project. They want to participate, but there is no incentive from them to participate unless we mandate it.

Mr. Chairman, that is the important thing. They are going to collect all the benefits from our taxpayer dollars. Why not share some of the burden?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I do not totally disagree, as I said earlier, but I believe for the issues that I had brought up that I think the substitute is more appropriate.

So, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I will not use the 5 minutes. I simply want to rise in support of the chairman's substitute, and I note that in the statements from the gentleman from Wisconsin he set forth the issue as being whether or not we wish to internationalize. In reality, I think that has been shown not to be the issue because I think all of us have a firm consensus here that we all want international contributions here.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, the DOE has indicated they could go even to 40 percent, and that would be fine with me. However, the one-third limitation I have no objection to necessarily.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is the important point. The issue is not whether we are for or against burden-sharing here as has been stated several times by the proponents of the original amendment. But the real issue is whether or not we want to temporarily set forth a kill of the construction and authority to move ahead while we wait and are tapping our fingers to determine when we are going

to hit that magic figure of 25-percent contribution.

I do not think any of us also has any doubt that Senator DOLE will do everything possible to get that foreign contribution.

So, Mr. Chairman, I simply do not believe that the original amendment was necessary. I think the substitute is very sound.

#### □ 1250

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 309, noes 16, not voting 106, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 166]

#### AYES—309

Anderson	Courter	Grant
Andrews	Coyne	Gray (IL)
Annuzio	Craig	Gray (PA)
Anthony	Crane	Gunderson
Applegate	Crockett	Hall (OH)
Archer	Dannemeyer	Hall (TX)
Armedy	Darden	Hamilton
Atkins	Davis (IL)	Hastert
Baker	Davis (MI)	Hayes (IL)
Ballenger	de la Garza	Hayes (LA)
Bartlett	DeLay	Hefner
Barton	Dellums	Henry
Bateman	Derrick	Herger
Bates	DeWine	Hertel
Bennett	Dickinson	Hiler
Bentley	Dicks	Hochbrueckner
Bereuter	Dingell	Holloway
Berman	DioGuardi	Hopkins
Bevill	Donnelly	Houghton
Bilbray	Dorgan (ND)	Hoyer
Bilirakis	Dornan (CA)	Hubbard
Billiey	Downey	Hughes
Boggs	Dreier	Hunter
Boland	Durbin	Hutto
Bonior	Dwyer	Inhofe
Borski	Dymally	Ireland
Bosco	Dyson	Jenkins
Boucher	Early	Johnson (CT)
Brennan	Eckart	Johnson (SD)
Brooks	Edwards (CA)	Jones (NC)
Brown (CO)	Edwards (OK)	Jontz
Bruce	Emerson	Kanjorski
Buechner	English	Kaptur
Bunning	Erdreich	Kasich
Burton	Evans	Kastenmeier
Byron	Fawell	Kennedy
Callahan	Feighan	Kennelly
Cardin	Fields	Kildee
Carr	Flake	Kolbe
Chandler	Florio	Kolter
Chapman	Foglietta	Kostmayer
Chappell	Ford (MI)	Kyl
Cheney	Frank	LaPalce
Clarke	Frost	Lagomarsino
Clay	Galleghy	Lancaster
Clement	Gallo	Lantos
Clinger	Gaydos	Latta
Coats	Gedens	Leach (IA)
Coble	Gekas	Leath (TX)
Coelho	Gephardt	Lehman (CA)
Coleman (MO)	Glickman	Lehman (FL)
Coleman (TX)	Gonzalez	Leland
Combest	Goodling	Lent
Conte	Gordon	Levin (MI)
Conyers	Gradison	Levine (CA)
Cooper	Grandy	Lewis (FL)

Lightfoot	Parris	Smith (TX)
Lipinski	Pashayan	Smith, Denny
Lloyd	Patterson	(OR)
Lowery (CA)	Pease	Smith, Robert
Lujan	Perkins	(NH)
Lukens, Thomas	Pickett	Smith, Robert
Lukens, Donald	Pickle	(OR)
Madigan	Porter	Snowe
Markey	Price	Solarz
Martin (IL)	Pursell	Solomon
Martinez	Quillen	Spratt
Matsui	Ravenel	Staggers
Mavroules	Regula	Stark
McCloskey	Rhodes	Stenholm
McCollum	Richardson	Stokes
McCrery	Ridge	Stratton
McCurdy	Rinaldo	Stump
McEwen	Ritter	Sundquist
McHugh	Robinson	Sweeney
McMillan (NC)	Roe	Swift
McMillen (MD)	Rogers	Swindall
Meyers	Rose	Synar
Mfume	Roth	Tallon
Michel	Roukema	Tauke
Miller (OH)	Rowland (CT)	Tauzin
Mineta	Rowland (GA)	Thomas (CA)
Moakley	Roybal	Thomas (GA)
Mollohan	Russo	Trafficant
Montgomery	Sabo	Traxler
Moorhead	Saiki	Udall
Morella	Savage	Upton
Morrison (CT)	Sawyer	Valentine
Mrazek	Saxton	Vento
Murtha	Schaefer	Volkmer
Myers	Scheuer	Vucanovich
Nagle	Schroeder	Walgren
Natcher	Schuetz	Watkins
Neal	Shaw	Weber
Nelson	Shays	Weldon
Nielson	Shumway	Wheat
Nowak	Shuster	Whittaker
Oberstar	Sikorski	Whitten
Obey	Siskis	Wolf
Olin	Skaggs	Wolpe
Owens (NY)	Slattery	Wylie
Oxley	Slaughter (VA)	Yates
Packard	Smith (FL)	Yatron
Panetta	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)

#### NOES—16

Boehlert	Miller (WA)	Slaughter (NY)
Espy	Molinari	Visclosky
Fish	Petri	Walker
Green	Schneider	Wortley
Lowry (WA)	Schumer	
McGrath	Sensenbrenner	

#### NOT VOTING—106

Ackerman	Guarini	Ortiz
Akaka	Hammerschmidt	Owens (UT)
Alexander	Hansen	Pelosi
Aspin	Harris	Penny
AuCoin	Hatcher	Pepper
Badham	Hawkins	Rahall
Barnard	Hefley	Rangel
Bellenson	Horton	Ray
Biaggi	Huckaby	Roberts
Bonker	Hyde	Rodino
Boulter	Jacobs	Rostenkowski
Boxer	Jeffords	Schulze
Broomfield	Jones (TN)	Sharp
Brown (CA)	Kemp	Skeen
Bryant	Klecza	Skelton
Bustamante	Konnyu	Smith (IA)
Campbell	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Carper	Lewis (GA)	Spence
Collins	Livingston	St Germain
Coughlin	Lott	Stallings
Daub	Lungren	Stangeland
DeFazio	Mack	Studds
Dixon	MacKay	Taylor
Dowdy	Manton	Torres
Duncan	Marlenee	Torricelli
Fascell	Martin (NY)	Towns
Fazio	Mazzoli	Vander Jagt
Flipppo	McCandless	Waxman
Foley	McDade	Weiss
Ford (TN)	Mica	Williams
Frenzel	Miller (CA)	Wilson
Garcia	Moody	Wise
Gibbons	Morrison (WA)	Wyden
Gilman	Murphy	Young (AK)
Gingrich	Nichols	
Gregg	Oakar	

□ 1307

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fazio for, with Mr. Jacobs against.

Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. MacKay against.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

□ 1310

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging in colloquy with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that this bill contains \$517,000 for continued operation of the Great Plains Coal Gasification Plant located in North Dakota. These funds are for continuing environmental compliance and administrative costs, and the plant is in fact accumulating revenues from the sale of natural gas which are going into an account that now contains over \$100 million. So the plant is in fact earning the Government money.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Energy is trying to sell this plant to a private company, and is currently evaluating eight bids which have been received. A decision is expected this summer.

The Federal Government has invested a great deal of money in this plant, which is one of the few of its kind in the world, and the only one in the United States. The plant uses technology on the cutting edge of scientific knowledge, and has been a technological success in every respect. We continue to gain new insights into alternative energy prospects from the operation of this plant, and I would just like to make sure that the objective of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee is to keep the plant up and running, regardless of whether it is the Federal Government or a private company that operates the plant.

Mr. ROE. My chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROE. I appreciate the concerns of the gentleman from North Dakota, who is correct that the plant is currently returning revenues to more than cover the operating expenses. I want to assure the gentleman that I agree that we must make sure the Great Plains Plant continues in oper-

ation. It is the committee's intention that if and when the Department of Energy sells this plant, it would impose whatever conditions are necessary to insure that the new owner continues full operation of the plant.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. And in the event the Department elects not to sell the plant, would the committee intend that the Department continue to operate the plant as long as it continues to benefit the future energy security of this country?

Mr. ROE. The gentleman is correct. That would be the committee's intention.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the chairman for his assurances and for his cooperation.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PACKARD

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACKARD: On page 12, following line 13, insert new subsection 107(6).

(6) STATE CONTRIBUTION.—(a) The superconducting super collider may only be sited in a State which has agreed to contribute to the project with non-Federal funds and/or in-kind contributions a minimum of ten per centum of the total initial estimated cost of the project as determined by the Secretary of Energy.

(b) The Secretary shall negotiate with the state to determine a mutually agreeable payment schedule not to exceed 20 years that does not conflict with a State's constitution or spending limits.

(c) The State may use contributions from nongovernmental agencies to meet this obligation.

(d) In kind contributions are those have a direct impact on the functioning of the facility, whether on or off the actual facility site. Such contributions shall include but not be limited to: materials; labor; technical expertise or studies; improvements made to infrastructure serving the site area such as roads and highways, airports, water and sewer, electricity and power; land and associated land, water, and mineral rights; contributions or improvements made to educational or academic facilities in support of research related to the project and conducted at the facility; housing and other benefits for the attendant working or research population; and the cost of any subsidies provided to the facility such as energy, water, or materials provided at less than market cost. Only such State or private expenditures as would not have been incurred but for the project shall be counted as in kind contributions for the purpose of this subsection.

(e) Any cash payments made by the selected state shall be refunded in cash by the Secretary in the event the facility is canceled or in the event funds are not appropriated to complete construction of the facility.

Mr. PACKARD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I think it is clear that this project if it is to succeed and be funded is going to have some help from other sources. We just passed an amendment that allows foreign participation. My amendment would ask that the State in which this project is ultimately sited, that State will be asked to contribute in all forms, in kind as well as cash contributions, at least 10 percent of the initial estimate of the project.

I think it is critical that this occur because the State that receives the project should give back to the project something because of the remarkable benefits that come to the State in which this will be sited. It actually adds up to billions of dollars in terms of jobs, in terms of economic benefits, and there will be significant benefits so I feel that the States should be required to participate in the construction costs and other costs. This can be done in a multitude of ways, and I urge support for my amendment.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I want to thank him for his courtesies in helping to forge an agreement out of his original amendment. We certainly have come a long way. It is a much better amendment now.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend and congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] for negotiating a compromise on this thorny issue, and really trying to work with the Members that are affected. I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], that unless we do have the support from the State and can show we are dead serious, certainly the support for this project will erode in this body.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] on his amendment if the State contribution is based upon the total initial estimated cost of the SSC as determined by the Secretary of Energy. It will not be an unknown cost further down the line. This is the initial estimated cost.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, in answer to the question of the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD] we have made every effort to eliminate an escalating project cost that the States would have an unending responsibility toward. To do that we have tied this requirement of 10 percent to the initial estimated cost of the project. Those estimations in my judgment will have to be made before the project is ever let out to bid and thus the State will know at that point what their commitment would be.



Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, in your non-Federal and contributions in kind, have you included State or private expenditures that would not have been incurred but for the project and shall be counted as in-kind contributions for the purpose of this subsection?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] for yielding, and for working and negotiating with members of the committee to iron out an acceptable amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD]. I am aware that she is looking to protect the small States and their competition for this project. We have tried to accommodate those matters.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask, if I might, a question or two of the author of this amendment.

Just so I am absolutely clear, is your intention that all of the in-kind contributions of a State including the land, the infrastructure, and all of the other things that might be done would count in any way toward the completion of this project, would they be counted as part of the State's participation?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is correct. We have not intended to withhold any of the State's contributions in terms of offsite or onsite improvements as long as they are required by the project.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my understanding is that the State would have to make this decision as to whether or not it would agree to participate at 10 percent, that it would know what the costs would be ahead of time. That is that the Secretary of Energy would make that initial cost determination and the State would agree to that.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is my understanding, that the Secretary as soon as those initial cost estimates are established, this would be before the bids are let out, and the States would be informed of that.

Mr. KOLBE. And if the gentleman will yield further for a final question, has any consideration been given since we just adopted an amendment which suggests there might be between 25 and 33 percent foreign participation, has any consideration been given to whether that would be counted or not counted in this determination?

Mr. PACKARD. No, it is not the intent of this amendment that the

State would be able to count foreign moneys, but they can count all moneys that are arranged for by their State from the private sector or from nongovernment sectors.

Mr. KOLBE. My question was, would that amount be deducted first? In other words, if it was a \$4 billion project and there was \$1 billion of foreign participation, is it 10 percent of \$4 billion or 10 percent of \$3 billion as the gentleman understands it?

Mr. PACKARD. On that point I would like to yield to the chairman of the committee as to his understanding.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that as far as foreign competition, that would be deducted from the overall cost because it does not relate to the overall cost.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] yielding.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, we have examined the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] on this side and I want to commend him and also commend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD] and others of the committee who worked so hard to bring this into reality and on that basis we would accept the amendment from the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] for his remarks.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think it is a thoughtful amendment from the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and I appreciate the opportunity to speak out on behalf of such a fine amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOEHLERT

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOEHLERT: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

"SEC. . CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY.—No funds are authorized and no funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Energy may be obligated or expended in fiscal year 1989 for clean coal technology demonstration projects unless the United States has first established

schedules and standards to achieve a substantial reduction in airborne emissions of sulfur and nitrogen oxides which are precursors of acid deposition. This section shall not apply to the 11 demonstration projects already selected for cofunding pursuant to Public Law 99-190 and Department of Energy Program Opportunity Notice number DE-PS01-86FE60966."

Mr. BOEHLERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I know the point of order will be sustained so I will start with that assumption. I want to make it absolutely clear that I support the Clean Coal Technology Program. I think the Clean Coal Technology Program is important for America for a whole lot of good reasons. It will protect coal mining employment and that is something that we have to be particularly sensitive to.

□ 1320

It will increase energy independence, and that is something that is extremely important. I support it, but I am concerned that we are spending money by the ton on a Clean Coal Technology Program when we have no program for the United States of America to deal with the serious problem of acid precipitation, and we should set standards, set a timetable.

Acid precipitation is recognized now as an international problem. It is no longer just a problem between New York and Ohio or even New York, New England and the Ohio River Valley States. It is truly an international problem. That was made abundantly clear 3 years ago in Quebec City when the President of the United States went to Canada to meet with Prime Minister Mulroney to talk about the areas of concern to our two nations, and I think a lot of people were surprised. They thought automatically the Prime Minister would say mutual defense is critically important, that is No. 1 on our agenda, or mutual trade, that is important, that is No. 2 on our agenda, but that is not what the Prime Minister said. He said the No. 1 issue of concern to Americans, Canadians, and the United States is acid rain.

We have got to do something. It is a cancer in the sky that is taking a devastating toll on the American economy, and we should do something about it. While I wish to proceed with a Clean Coal Technology Program, I am supportive of it, and I think it is a wise

investment of our dollars, I also wish to see in conjunction with that Clean Coal Technology Program a timetable for action to use the benefit of the clean coal technology to reduce the cancer in the sky, the acid precipitation that is causing so much damage.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think we share a concern for clean air. This should be a No. 1 objective in our health programs, to ensure that the air we breathe is clean. I just want to say that I think the Clean Coal Program is moving along with a lot of success. The first offering brought in a number of projects. Some 50 projects were offered, 9 were selected, 7 underway.

The requirements in the Clean Coal Program were that the private sector had to at least match the Federal dollars 50-50. As a matter of fact, on the first round the private sector is putting up 65 percent of the money for the projects. I think it illustrates very clearly that there is a strong commitment out there on the part of the private sector to develop the technology that will enable us to use America's greatest energy resource in a way that does not impact on the environment adversely.

We have in the United States today proven reserves of coal of about 500 million tons, and this translates in terms of Btu's, that translates into the equivalent of 1½ trillion barrels of oil, and we need to use that to develop the energy independence of the United States.

I think that our objectives are the same. It is important that we continue the Clean Coal Program, that we do it in a way that is productive and a good use of our scientific resources.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LUJAN. I want to congratulate the gentleman on offering this amendment.

He is absolutely correct. There is no question about it, the Clean Coal Technology Program is doing absolutely nothing to clean up our air. We have researched the question of acid rain to death. We know the problem. We know what must be done, and we know how to solve it with the available technology. We should get on with it. I congratulate the gentleman for bringing it up.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague. We study, study, study. All the experts tell us we have all the technology we need to get on with at least a partial solution of the problem. We are never going to come up with a partial solution of the

problem until we have the benefit of a successful Clean Coal Program. However, I would point out that Governor Kean of New Jersey said it so well, that if all we do is to continue to study the problem, we will end up with the best documented environmental disaster in history, and the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of my committee and a neighbor, knows full well that the Governor speaks the truth. We have got to get on with the job of cleaning up after the problem of acid rain, and I want to do that in conjunction with moving ahead with the Clean Coal Technology Program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has expired.

(On request of Mr. COATS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BOEHLERT was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. COATS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOEHLERT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COATS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, my friend, for yielding.

I just want to respond to the gentleman from New Mexico, in response to his statement or assertion that the Clean Coal Program has not done anything to reduce acid rain. The very reason why we want to continue the funding for the Clean Coal Program is to develop the technology so we can do something about acid rain. That is why we do not want to put a roadblock in. We do not want to stop it. Right now some very promising technology is underway with some significant gains to clean the air, to burn a much cleaner coal; second, the Clean Air Act currently in law is reducing sulfur dioxide emissions and nitrous oxide emissions in this country. Let us not frame it from the standpoint that nothing is being done. A substantial amount is being done.

Billions are being spent, and we are saying that with the precious resources we have here at home, we have the ability to develop the technology to bring about the objective both gentlemen are trying to achieve.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will point out that both gentlemen are right. I am not trying to be a diplomat. I think the gentleman from New Mexico is right. We are not using the technology already developed effectively, and as a result of that, all Americans are suffering from the adverse effects of acid precipitation.

On the other hand, the Clean Coal Technology Program is moving forward at a snail's pace, and a lot of the projects are long range in nature rather than offering some potential immediate benefit. We have got to deal with the problem of acid precipitation. It is the most serious unattended environmental problem facing the

United States of America today. I would like to see us move forward with that in conjunction with a workable Clean Coal Technology Program.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, this is neither the time nor the place to have an acid rain debate. The Energy and Commerce Committee is working on acid rain legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN'S Subcommittee on Health and Environment is in the process of marking up a clean air bill which includes acid rain provisions.

My Subcommittee on Energy and Power is holding hearings on acid rain. We had a hearing on the science last week; we are having a hearing on conservation and acid rain in 2 weeks; a field hearing in Indianapolis in 3 weeks; and a hearing on acid rain and clean coal technology also in 3 weeks.

While clean coal and acid rain are related, there are benefits to the current Clean Coal Technology Program without consideration of acid rain controls. We should not hold the program hostage to the resolution of a particularly knotty political issue.

The new solicitation for the Clean Coal Technology Program has drawn 54 proposed projects, valued at more than \$5.3 billion.

There is no better indication, Mr. Chairman, of the extent of interest in this program—which mandates strict cost sharing between the Government and the private sector.

The Clean Coal Technology Program is an important energy security plan. It will lead to more efficient utilization of our most abundant domestic energy resource.

This program will lead to the development of technologies that have distinct environmental advantages—they will be cleaner than a variety of conventional coal technologies.

It will also lead to the development of more cost-effective compliance options for meeting any prospective State or Federal acid rain requirements.

This program is fulfilling an agreement we made with Canada to move to solve the cross boundary pollution problem through a joint Government and private sector investment in clean coal.

In short, Mr. Chairman, although I reserve my rights to continue to be a friendly critic of this program as the Energy and Commerce Committee exercises its oversight responsibilities. I remain a strong supporter of the program and would strongly oppose any proposal such as the one before us today that could jeopardize our forward progress.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] wish to pursue his point of order?

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: At the end of section 112 add a new section as follows: SEC. 113. (a) The Secretary shall award to a domestic firm a contract that,



under the use of competitive procedures, would be awarded to a foreign firm, if—

(1) the final product of the domestic firm will be completely assembled in the United States;

(2) when completely assembled, not less than 50 percent of the final product of the domestic firm will be domestically produced; and

(3) the difference between the bids submitted by the foreign and domestic firms is not more than 6 percent.

(b) This section shall not apply to the extent to which—

(1) such applicability would not be in the public interest;

(2) compelling national security considerations require otherwise; or

(3) the United States Trade Representative determines that such an award would be in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or an international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section—

(1) the term "domestic firm" means a business entity that is organized under the laws of the United States and that conducts business operations in the United States; and

(2) the term "foreign firm" means a business entity not described in paragraph (1).

(d) This section shall apply only to contracts for which—

(1) amounts are made available pursuant to this Act; and

(2) solicitations for bids are issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) All funds made available under section 107 of this Act are exempt from the provisions of this section.

(f) The Secretary shall report to the Congress on contracts covered under this Act and entered into with foreign entities in fiscal year 1988 and shall report to the Congress on the number of contracts that meet the requirements of subsection (a) but which are determined by the United States Trade Representative to be in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or an international agreement to which the United States is party. The Secretary shall also report to the Congress on the number of contracts covered under this Act and awarded based upon the parameters of section 113. The Secretary shall submit such report to the Committee on Science, Space and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate by January 1, 1990.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this is my Buy American language and it is the standard language that I have offered to many bills, and it has no hidden revelations to it. I offer it to the committee in good faith.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, the committee has examined the amendment

on this side of the aisle and has no objections to the amendment.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, we have also examined it on this side, and we have no objection. Let me tell the gentleman that I congratulate him. He has been a leader in the Buy American amendments throughout all the bills, and I congratulate him for it, and I urge the approval.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I also want to congratulate the gentleman on this amendment, and I wholeheartedly support him.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of delaying the expenditure of clean coal funding until an acid rain control program is in place.

I have addressed this House many times about horror stories of acid rain damage.

Most people will admit—even if off the record—that acid rain is a very serious environmental problem. And in my opinion the problem is more like a disaster. Lakes and streams are dead and dying. Forests are declining in record numbers, and studies have documented that acid rain has a measurable affect on human health.

That information is not new to anyone who has examined this issue. What has not been examined very closely, however, is the smokescreen called clean coal. Four years ago, I was practically alone in opposing this "Son of Synfuels" program. I was opposed because I sensed two looming consequences that would set back acid rain control efforts for years and that would cost other important energy programs dearly. And those same two consequences are surfacing this year, as the administration begins to spend the \$1 billion already appropriated for clean coal.

First of all, let's make no mistake about it.

The clean coal is plainly and simply a corporate welfare program. It subsidizes industry for expenditures that should be paid for by the private sector. We're not talking about acid rain control here, we're talking about pork. Take a look at the projects DOE is selecting. Just a month ago, a project across the West Virginia border, costing \$185 million in Federal funds, will make SO<sub>2</sub> reductions all

right. But these reductions will cost thousands of dollars per ton.

We have technology right now, on the shelf, that can reduce acid rain emissions by 95 percent, and these scrubbers cost only \$500 per ton. This project is just a way for those companies to repower these plants at the expense of Federal taxpayers.

The second consequence of spending more on clean coal directly affects the work of this committee, and my friend Bob Roe should listen closely to this problem.

H.R. 4505 correctly restores cuts to vital energy research programs. The Science and Technology Committee has made excellent recommendations for fossil energy and energy conservation programs. But appropriations at these relatively modest levels are seriously jeopardized by clean coal funding.

Just yesterday, the Appropriations Committee was faced with a stark choice. The \$500 million in advance appropriations for fiscal year 1989 would have to be scored with all other programs.

That means we have to make deep reductions in important domestic programs to pay for clean coal. I'm sure this committee would find it difficult to come up with \$500 million in reductions in the fossil or conservation budgets. But that's the choice we have. Next week, when the Interior bill is considered, these reductions might have to be made.

Clean coal has had a free ride for a long time, but now we have to pay the price. And I am ready to join with any other Member in pairing this program back to a reasonable level.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not against the development of new, cleaner burning technologies, but any Federal involvement in such a program must be accompanied by an emission reduction program. We could end up spending billions on corporate subsidies, without reducing acid rain by one drop.

We can't afford to waste scarce Federal resources, and our environment can't afford more delays.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, if we want to remain a leader in the scientific world, we must move forward with the superconducting super collider project. Our international counterparts have moved forward aggressively in basic research, while we are beginning to lag behind. Many nations today spend two or three times the amount we spend on basic research.

The bill before us here today, authorizes funding for this important project. The amount is not as much as the administration had hoped for, or as much as many of us hoped for, but it is a start in our efforts to construct the largest, most advanced scientific instrument ever built.

The benefits the superconducting super collider will provide the United States are numerous. Beside the fact that this instrument will

be the largest particle accelerator in the world and will provide us with the basic knowledge of the nature of matter, the super collider will spur an increased emphasis on math and science in our educational systems. I believe we have a responsibility to future generations to provide them with the knowledge and technology they will need to be competitive.

Currently, the United States sets the standard for scientific research. If we lose our leadership, this may no longer be the case. While it is impossible to prove to you today what we will reap from this super collider experiment in the future, we all know that scientific curiosity ultimately leads to enormous advances in technology and scientific discovery.

While I believe that we should invite international cooperation in this endeavor, we must not require international support before moving forward with its construction. I urge my colleagues to oppose any efforts to reduce the funding provided in this bill for the superconducting super collider and to oppose unnecessary prerequisites for its construction.

The superconducting super collider project will be one of basic research which will ultimately provide us with new technologies, new industries and new jobs.

□ 1330

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MURTHA] having assumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4505) to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for civilian research and development programs for fiscal year 1989, pursuant to House Resolution 460, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 290, nays 27, not voting 114, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—290

Anderson	Florio	McMillan (NC)
Andrews	Foglietta	McMillen (MD)
Annunzio	Ford (MI)	Meyers
Anthony	Frank	Mfume
Applegate	Gallegly	Michel
Army	Gallo	Miller (OH)
Aspin	Gaydos	Miller (WA)
Atkins	Gejdenson	Mineta
Baker	Gephardt	Moakley
Ballenger	Glickman	Mollinari
Bartlett	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Barton	Goodling	Montgomery
Bateman	Gradison	Moorhead
Bates	Grant	Morella
Bennett	Gray (IL)	Morrison (CT)
Bentley	Gray (PA)	Mrazek
Berman	Green	Murtha
Bevill	Gunderson	Myers
Bilbray	Hall (OH)	Nagle
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Natcher
Billey	Hamilton	Neal
Boehlert	Hastert	Nelson
Boggs	Hayes (IL)	Nowak
Bonior	Hayes (LA)	Oberstar
Borski	Hefner	Owens (NY)
Bosco	Henry	Oxley
Boucher	Herger	Packard
Brennan	Hertel	Panetta
Brooks	Hiler	Parris
Bruce	Hochbrueckner	Pashayan
Buechner	Holloway	Patterson
Bunning	Hopkins	Perkins
Byron	Houghton	Pickett
Callahan	Hoyer	Pickle
Cardin	Hubbard	Porter
Carr	Hughes	Price
Chandler	Hunter	Pursell
Chapman	Hutto	Quillen
Chappell	Hyde	Ravenel
Clarke	Inhofe	Regula
Clement	Ireland	Rhodes
Clinger	Jenkins	Richardson
Coats	Johnson (CT)	Ridge
Coble	Johnson (SD)	Rinaldo
Coelho	Jones (NC)	Roe
Coleman (MO)	Jontz	Rogers
Coleman (TX)	Kanjorski	Rose
Combest	Kaptur	Roth
Conte	Kasich	Roukema
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Rowland (CT)
Cooper	Kennedy	Rowland (GA)
Courter	Kennelly	Roybal
Coyne	Kildee	Russo
Crockett	Kolbe	Sabo
Darden	Kolter	Salki
Davis (IL)	Kostmayer	Savage
Davis (MI)	Kyl	Sawyer
de la Garza	Lagomarsino	Saxton
Dellums	Lancaster	Scheuer
Derrick	Lantos	Schneider
DeWine	Latta	Schroeder
Dickinson	Leath (TX)	Schuetter
Dicks	Lehman (CA)	Schumer
Dingell	Lehman (FL)	Shaw
DioGuardi	Leland	Shumway
Donnelly	Lent	Shuster
Dorgan (ND)	Levin (MI)	Sikorski
Dornan (CA)	Levine (CA)	Sisisky
Downey	Lewis (FL)	Skaggs
Durbin	Lipinski	Slattery
Dwyer	Lloyd	Slaughter (NY)
Dymally	Lowery (CA)	Slaughter (VA)
Dyson	Lowry (WA)	Smith (FL)
Early	Lujan	Smith (NJ)
Eckart	Luken, Thomas	Smith (TX)
Edwards (CA)	Lukens, Donald	Smith, Robert
Edwards (OK)	Madigan	(OR)
Emerson	Martin (IL)	Snowe
English	Martinez	Solarz
Erdreich	Mavroules	Spratt
Espy	McCloskey	Staggers
Evans	McCollum	Stark
Fawell	McCrery	Stenholm
Feighan	McCurdy	Stokes
Fields	McEwen	Stratton
Fish	McGrath	Sundquist
Flake	McHugh	Sweeney

Swift  
Swindall  
Synar  
Tallon  
Tauke  
Tausin  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (GA)  
Traficant  
Traxler

Udall  
Upton  
Valentine  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Walgren  
Watkins  
Weber  
Weldon

Wheat  
Whittaker  
Whitten  
Wolf  
Wolpe  
Wortley  
Wylie  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young (FL)

NAYS—27

Archer  
Bereuter  
Burton  
Cheney  
Craig  
Crane  
Dannemeyer  
DeLay  
Dreier  
Gekas

Grandy  
Leach (IA)  
Lightfoot  
McCandless  
Nielsen  
Obey  
Olin  
Pease  
Petri  
Ritter

Sensenbrenner  
Shays  
Smith, Denny  
(OR)  
Solomon  
Stump  
Vucanovich  
Walker

NOT VOTING—114

Ackerman  
Akaka  
Alexander  
AuCoin  
Badham  
Barnard  
Bellenson  
Biaggi  
Boland  
Bonker  
Boulter  
Boxer  
Broomfield  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (CO)  
Bryant  
Bustamante  
Campbell  
Carper  
Clay  
Collins  
Coughlin  
Daub  
DeFazio  
Dixon  
Dowdy  
Duncan  
Fascell  
Fazio  
Filippo  
Foley  
Ford (TN)  
Frenzel  
Frost  
Garcia  
Gibbons  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Gordon

Gregg  
Guarini  
Hammerschmidt  
Hansen  
Harris  
Hatcher  
Hawkins  
Hefley  
Horton  
Huckaby  
Jacobs  
Jeffords  
Jones (TN)  
Kemp  
Klecza  
Konnyu  
LaFalce  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Livingston  
Lott  
Lungren  
Mack  
MacKay  
Manton  
Markey  
Marlenee  
Martin (NY)  
Matsui  
Mazzoli  
McDade  
Mica  
Miller (CA)  
Moody  
Morrison (WA)  
Murphy  
Nichols  
Oakar  
Ortiz

Owens (UT)  
Pelosi  
Penny  
Pepper  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Ray  
Roberts  
Robinson  
Rodino  
Rostenkowski  
Schaefer  
Schulze  
Sharp  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith, Robert  
(NH)  
Spence  
St Germain  
Stallings  
Stangeland  
Studds  
Taylor  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Vander Jagt  
Waxman  
Weiss  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wyden  
Young (AK)

□ 1352

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Manton for, with Mr. Jacobs against.  
Mr. Lewis of California for, with Mr. Frenzel against.

Mr. Kleczka for, with Mr. Konnyu against.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH and Mr. PEASE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and



include extraneous matter, on H.R. 4505 the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 4417, NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1989**

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology have until 4 p.m. today to file a report on the bill, H.R. 4417.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

**NATIONAL SHUT-IN DAY**

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 145) to authorize "National Shut-In Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the minority has no objection to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would point out that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL] is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 145 to authorize "National Shut-In Day."

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to mention that Mr. RAHALL had to leave for his district so he is not here to present his resolution. I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for making note of that fact.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 145

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the first Sunday in June of each year as "National Shut-In Day" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day by visiting at least one shut-in person on the special day if possible, and by participating in other appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

**AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DYMALLY**

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYMALLY: Lines 4 and 5, strike "the first Sunday in June of each year" and insert "June 5, 1988,".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

**TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DYMALLY**

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. DYMALLY: Amend the title to read as follows: "Joint resolution designating June 5, 1988, as 'National Shut-In Day'."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**NATIONAL SCLERODERMA AWARENESS WEEK**

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 266) to designate the week beginning June 12, 1988, as "National Scleroderma Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 476 to designate the week beginning June 12, 1988, as "National Scleroderma Awareness Week."

Mr. FAWELL. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Joint Resolution 266, which designates the second week of June of this year for the purpose of educating Americans about the symptoms and treatment of scleroderma. I am pleased to be the chief sponsor of identical legislation in the House, House Joint Resolution 476, which 202 of our colleagues are also cosponsoring.

Scleroderma is a rare disorder which afflicts 300,000 Americans, about two-thirds of whom are women over the age of 45. However, scleroderma can occur at anytime in a person's life without any predisposition of prior illness. Scleroderma is not hereditary, nor is it contagious, but it can be fatal

if progression is not halted at the onset of symptoms.

Unfortunately, attaining proper diagnosis and therapeutic treatment is difficult for victims because of the rarity of the condition and its mysterious symptoms. Scleroderma is characterized by an overproduction of collagen, a protein manufactured by the connective tissues of the body, which is then deposited in various organs and body tissues. Victim's skin gradually hardens, thickens and tightens, and the fingers may stiffen and curl. Stiff and swollen joints and extreme sensitivity to cool temperatures cause further discomfort to scleroderma patients. Progression of the disease to the internal organs can complicate the digestive and respiratory systems.

I had the unfortunate experience of learning about the tragedy of scleroderma when a member of my district office staff died as a result of the disorder. Another constituent of mine contacted me this spring requesting that I do something to help alleviate the suffering that victims undergo. Research funded through a combination of grants from the National Institutes of Health and private foundations, such as the Scleroderma Foundation of Greater Chicago, have yielded therapeutic drugs helpful in slowing the progression of scleroderma upon diagnosis.

Designating the second week of June for the purpose of educating Americans, particularly medical professionals, about the symptoms of scleroderma and the help available to them fulfills this purpose even further. I am hopeful that research will continue to explain why this disease develops and that medical talent will develop a cure.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House follow the Senate lead in passing Senate Joint Resolution 266 by unanimous consent.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] for his informative and moving comments on scleroderma.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 266

Whereas scleroderma is a disease in which connective tissue in the body becomes hardened and rigid, and might afflict any part of the body;

Whereas approximately 300,000 people in the United States suffer from scleroderma;

Whereas women are afflicted by scleroderma 3 times more often than men;

Whereas scleroderma is a chronic and often progressive illness that can result in death;

Whereas the symptoms of scleroderma vary greatly from person to person and can complicate and confuse diagnosis;

Whereas the cause and cure of scleroderma are unknown; and

Whereas scleroderma is an orphan disease, and is considered to be under studied; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the week beginning June 12, 1988, is designated as "National Scleroderma Awareness Week", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL DAIRY GOAT AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 423) to designate the third week in June 1988 as "National Dairy Goat Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the minority has no objection to the legislation before us.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

#### H.J. RES. 423

Whereas United States goat cheeses are in demand by consumers and replacing imported cheeses;

Whereas due to the efficiency of the modern domestic dairy goat, which produces an excellent healthful milk, the dairy goat is becoming increasingly popular and useful on our Nation's family farms;

Whereas United States farmers have developed a dairy goat that produces superior milk and that is sought after and exported worldwide; and

Whereas there is a need to further educate consumers as to the high nutritional value of products made from goats' milk: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That—

(1) the period beginning the second Saturday, and ending the third Saturday, of June 1988 is designated as "National Dairy Goat Awareness Week"; and

(2) the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on

the people of the United States to commemorate such week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the three joint resolutions just passed, House Joint Resolution 145, Senate Joint Resolution 266, and House Joint Resolution 423.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1400

#### REAGAN DID GREAT JOB IN MOSCOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, if anyone has had any doubts about who has been and still is the leader of the free world, he or she should have listened this morning to the eloquent words of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher who gave the praise to President Reagan that he so richly deserves.

Praise that has not and will not be given by our media. Too often, these last 4 days I have read and heard that President Reagan looked fatigued.

Whatever happened to the term "jet lag" that is used by and behalf of everybody else.

It's eight time zones difference between the District of Columbia and Moscow, which is less than between the District of Columbia and Honolulu. If anybody has made that trip, he or she knows how difficult it is to rebound on a moment's notice.

The President accomplished much. Even the commentators begrudgingly admitted that he has finally raised human rights to such a level it has a place in future summit discussions.

And Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev signed the INF Treaty. Even those of us who have some reservations about it realize that a huge step has been taken toward reducing the nuclear threat.

Only 7½ years of good leadership could have brought us to this point; 7½ years of a realization that you can only deal from strength.

President Reagan's "be wary, be vigilant, and be strong" have been the watchwords of his administration. Prime Minister Thatcher thanked him

for the free world. And after four summits, so should we.

#### THE 42D ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, 1946, the citizens of Italy voted resoundingly to replace their constitutional monarchy with a democratic form of government. In the 42 years since, Italy has put together successfully a society, economy, and government that had been shattered by the Second World War. Her perseverance has enabled her to move again to the forefront of the Western World, and her economic gains have been so astounding that His Excellency, Hon. Rinaldo Petrignani, Italian Ambassador to the United States, has justifiably defined these gains as an "economic renaissance."

The Italian Republic's relationship with the United States has been fostered and strengthened in the last four decades. As a sister member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Italy has been a most stalwart and loyal ally to the United States. The United States and the Italian Republic have persisting cultural ties to one another, not only because millions of Americans are of Italian descent, but also because much of our Western literature and art originated in Italy. And today, our nations continue to work together in an exchange of trade and technology that is mutually beneficial.

In early February of this year, a forum was held in Washington, DC, jointly sponsored by the Wilson Center and the Fondazione Agnelli entitled, "Italy: Political, Social, and Economic Change Since 1945." At the conference, Ambassador Petrignani reflected upon Italy's recent developments and on her relationship with the United States, as she proceeds through her fifth decade of existence.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include Ambassador Petrignani's most cogent and candid remarks, which follow:

CONFERENCE ON ITALY SPONSORED BY THE WILSON CENTER AND THE FONDAZIONE AGNELLI, FEBRUARY 2, 1988

(Introduction by Ambassador Petrignani)

Let me express my highest appreciation to the Wilson Center and to the Fondazione Agnelli for promoting and hosting this conference on Italy.

The importance of the event is clear. The debate that you are initiating today will render a remarkable service both to Americans and to Italians in fostering in the United States a better understanding of one of America's staunchest and more reliable allies. In doing so, this seminar will also greatly help those who are working hard in Italy and the United States to make the political and human bonds between the two countries even stronger.

I am proud to say that I have been one of the advocates of these bonds for a very long time. So, welcoming you and inaugurating this event is for me both a privilege I greatly appreciate and a source of very special satisfaction.



Indeed, this seminar fills a vacuum. Strangely, there is a lot more to learn about Italy. We do enjoy a very strong and friendly relationship with United States. Cooperation between the two governments is the closest and expands into an intense series of contacts and consultations at all levels. Trade, tourism, exchanges of all sorts are flourishing. A large Italian American community plays an important role in bringing the two countries closer and closer together. And yet, Italy itself is a topic on which—it seems to me—there is still a lot to learn among the American public. Let me explain.

Most people in America seem to have a pretty definite idea of Italy as one of the cradles of art in the world. Nobody would dispute that. Her cultural heritage enjoys universal recognition as one of the great sources of Western civilization. The ideal of harmony and beauty, so typically Italian, which once inspired Raphael and Michelangelo, lives on today in the "Italian style" that has made Italian fashion and industrial design famous in the whole world. Equally, the "quality of life" in Italy, which was rated one of the highest in the world by foreign analysts last year, has helped to create a new image of our country.

Also, some of Italy's most remarkable economic performances seem to have impressed both experts and world public opinion in general. The 1980's have witnessed a turn-about in most of our economic indicators: Inflation was brought down dramatically, productivity sprang up, profits began to pour back into the private sector and losses were cut back substantially even in the public sector. A new outburst of entrepreneurialism changed the very mood of the nation, and showed the world a new generation of bold businessmen—the giants of the "second economic renaissance"—whose drive is claiming an assertive role well beyond our borders. All in all, it has been an impressive test of vitality, which by itself has suggested a much more realistic evaluation of Italy's potential as an industrial power.

But when it comes to Italy as a political and social system, then unfortunately the image of the country still remains blurred. Italian politics are often referred to by some foreign observers as a series of baroque maneuvers leading to dangerous instability. The country social texture is periodically criticized. The historical continuity between our past and contemporary Italian society is generally ignored.

Of all the major European States, Italy seems to be one of the least studied.

Why is that so?

Possibly because some of the features of Italian democracy are very unique. Maybe a quick reference to some of them will be worthwhile.

A recent book published in the United States has pointed out that a traditional gulf still exists in Italy between society and government. People look at authority with a measure of skepticism. This can help explain why State authority itself is weaker than one would expect, and why the power of the executive branch in Italy is more limited than in other democracies.

Unlike other Western democracies, a clear-cut two-party system did not take root in Italy. Several parties, divided by deep ideological cleavages, have given political representation to widely diverging groups and trends and, in the process, also—let us not forget—to one of the most open and free societies in the world.

The electoral law favors in fact a very high degree of proportional representation,

which is possibly the reason why we have so many political parties in parliament. Coalition governments are the necessary consequence of the political fragmentation of the democratic forces. But coalition governments do not function easily. They tend to give rise to frequent Cabinet crisis, producing thus the impression of Cabinet instability which has contributed so much to a negative image of Italian democracy. Only recently many Americans have begun to understand that Cabinet instability does not equate with political instability, and that Italy, on the contrary, is a very stable country, as proven by the electoral trends and by the fact that government majorities have almost always been composed by the same political parties for the last 25 years.

Last but not least, there is a Communist question. Four decades after the Republican constitution was adopted a fairly substantial part of the Italian vote still does not fully integrate in the process of government at national level. True, Communists have changed a lot over the years. Yet, the so-called "K factor" still represents an element in Italian politics which makes the functioning of our system different from that of other major European democracies.

No wonder Italy, if compared to other democratic models, is far from easy to understand. Facts, however, should be recognized.

And facts show that in spite of stereotypes and Cassandras Italy is fundamentally a dynamic country. Italian democracy is thriving and alive. Its story is a success story: democracy raised a dejected nation from World War II high into the group of the seven most industrialized countries in the world; it transformed an agricultural society into a technologically advanced economy; it ensured our people an unparalleled degree of openness and freedom which has defeated in the seventies and early eighties the most vicious attacks of terrorism. It is too easy to say that Italy did all this "in spite" of its political system. It is a fact that it was the Italian democracy which has presided over this profound transformation of our national life.

The alliance and the friendship with the United States played a key role in all this.

The Italian Republic has proved so alive and vital because since the very beginning a clear majority of our people has embraced unequivocally the values of freedom and democracy the United States helped us to recover. Italy went back into the mainstream of the Western World thanks to that help and thanks to the vision, courage and perseverance of millions of Italian men and women who strongly believed in those values and who recognized in America the leader nation for the defence of freedom and democracy in the entire world.

Friendship with America, support of NATO and the pursuit of European unification have so become, for more than 40 years now, the keystone of our stance in the international arena.

Italy has never deviated from that course, and never will.

In fact, never before in Italian history has there been such a large popular support for our foreign policy as there is today.

And if this is so, it is because friendship with America, NATO, and European unification is the external expression of that same basic policy which aims internally at the modernization of Italian society and at the strengthening of our democracy.

And this also probably explains why any recognition that Italy gains amongst the

Western nations, any enhancement of her status as a full partner of the United States in Europe, bolsters the democratic forces at home which support Italian active participation in the international arena; and reciprocally, any strengthening and broadening of the political and economic base of democracy in Italy in turn makes Italian foreign policy more effective and more able to make a useful contribution to the common agenda of the West.

But this democracy needs to be understood—and it needs recognition. For the preservation of the very political constituency which made Italy a mature democracy and a reliable ally for the United States, it is important that Americans give us the credit we deserve without taking us for granted.

In a world confronted by an increasing diffusion of power and major economic challenges, at a time in which East-West relations seem about to enter such a new, promising phase, the friendship between Italy and the United States can and must play an important role in everybody's interest, for the strengthening of our common security, for the progress of the East-West dialog, and for a better relationship between North and South.

But, again, for the Italian-American friendship to develop its full potential, a constant effort is needed so that clear, updated image of Italy is being projected in the United States: not to the American Government only, but also to Congress, to the media, to the American people itself.

This conference will give—I am sure—a most significant contribution to this end, and it deserves therefore our fullest appreciation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my warmest wishes to the citizens of the Italian Republic, as well as to the Americans of Italian descent within the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am honored to represent, and to all Italian-Americans across the United States who are marking this 42d anniversary observance. May the Italian Republic continue on its road to prosperity, and in its role as a vanguard of freedom and democracy in the modern world.

#### THE CENTENNIAL OF BASEBALL'S MOST FAMOUS BAL-LAD—100 YEARS OF "CASEY AT THE BAT"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, in this hallowed Hall in this historic building, we commemorate events of great significance for our Nation and for the American people.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my distinguished colleagues to the centennial of the publication of one of the best-known works in American literature—I refer, of course, to the anniversary of the first publication of "Casey at the Bat." This anniversary holds a special significance for me since this classic first appeared 100 years ago today in the San Francisco Examiner.

One hundred years ago, Ernest Lawrence Thayer, a journalist for the Hearst Newspaper's San Francisco Examiner dashed off "Casey at the Bat" in a few hours. The ballad was published on June 3, 1888, and instantly became a classic. The actor De Wolfe Hoyer included the poem in his repertoire and recited it more than 15,000 times.

Baseball, Mr. Speaker, is one of the highlights of American culture, one of America's greatest contributions to world civilization. As the former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, said, "Next to religion, baseball has furnished a greater impact on American life than any other institution."

Mr. Speaker, no speech about baseball is complete without reference to the great Casey Stengel. Let me mention his most famous quotation. After Stengel was honored as baseball's greatest living manager, he rose and addressed the audience: "I want to thank all my players for giving me the honor of being what I was."

On this auspicious anniversary, the lyric strains of "Casey at the Bat" should be included in the RECORD of this day's proceedings so that my colleagues may reflect on its profound sentiments:

#### CASEY AT THE BAT

(By Ernest Lawrence Thayer)

The outlook wasn't brilliant for the Mudville nine that day;  
The score stood four to two with but one inning more to play.  
And then when Cooney died at first and Barrows did the same,  
A sickly silence fell upon the patrons of the game.  
A straggling few got up to go in deep despair. The rest  
Clung to the hope which springs eternal in the human breast;  
They thought if only Casey could but get a whack at that—  
We'd put up even money now with Casey at the bat.  
But Flynn preceded Casey, as did also Jimmy Blake,  
And the former was a lulu and the latter was a cake;  
So upon that stricken multitude grim melancholy sat,  
For there seemed but little chance of Casey's getting to the bat.  
But Flynn let drive a single, to the wonderment of all,  
And Blake, the much despised, tore the cover off the ball;  
And when the dust had lifted, and the men saw what had occurred,  
There was Jimmy safe at second and Flynn a-hugging third.  
Then from five thousand throats and more there rose a lusty yell;  
It rumbled through the valley, it rattled in the dell;  
It knocked upon the mountain and recoiled upon the flat,  
For Casey, mighty Casey, was advancing to the bat.  
There was ease in Casey's manner as he stepped into his place;

There was pride in Casey's bearing and a smile on Casey's face.  
And when, responding to the cheers, he lightly doffed his hat,  
No stranger in the crowd could doubt 'twas Casey at the bat.  
Ten thousand eyes were on him as he rubbed his hands with dirt;  
Five thousand tongues applauded when he wiped them on his shirt.  
Then while the writhing pitcher ground the ball into his hip,  
Defiance gleamed in Casey's eye, a sneer curled Casey's lip.  
And now the leather-covered sphere came hurtling through the air,  
And Casey stood a-watching it in haughty grandeur there.  
Close by the sturdy batsman the ball unheeded sped—  
"That ain't my style," said Casey. "Strike one," the umpire said.  
From the benches, black with people, there went up a muffled roar,  
Like the beating of the storm waves on a stern and distant shore.  
"Kill him! Kill the umpire!" shouted someone on the stand;  
And it's likely they'd have killed him had not Casey raised his hand.  
With a smile of Christian charity great Casey's visage shone;  
He stilled the rising tumult; he bade the game go on;  
He signaled to the pitcher, and once more the spheroid flew;  
But Casey still ignored it, and the umpire said, "Strike two."  
"Fraud!" cried the maddened thousands, and echo answered, "Fraud!"  
But one scornful look from Casey and the audience was awed.  
They saw his face grow stern and cold, they saw his muscles strain,  
And they knew that Casey wouldn't let that ball go by again.  
The sneer is gone from Casey's lip, his teeth are clenched in hate;  
He pounds with cruel violence his bat upon the plate.  
And now the pitcher holds the ball, and now he lets it go,  
And now the air is shattered by the force of Casey's blow.  
Oh, somewhere in this favored land the sun is shining bright;  
The band is playing somewhere, and somewhere hearts are light,  
And somewhere men are laughing, and somewhere children shout;  
But there is no joy in Mudville—mighty Casey has struck out.

□ 1410

#### HEAD OF OMB SAYS VETERANS' PROGRAMS ARE LOW PRIORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of a letter sent by the head of OMB, Jim Miller, to Mr. EDDIE BOLAND, chairman of the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, which says that the Congress is providing too much money for veterans' programs. I think that it's time for Mr. Miller, and some members of his staff, to come

down out of their ivory tower and have a look at the real world of VA programs.

Should they decide to leave the comfort of their offices and visit the 16 VA hospitals committee staff visited recently, they would discover that 1,700 VA hospital beds have been secretly closed because of staffing shortages. Yet, in his letter, Mr. Miller says that Congress is giving VA too much money for staff to treat sick veterans.

Were they to come down from their ivory tower, they would find that veterans' claims for compensation and pension often take twice as long as they should to process because VA doesn't have enough staff in its regional offices. A veteran who is eligible for pension benefits may have no means by which to live.

But Mr. Miller ignores the increasing delays in processing such claims, saying that VA employees should be more productive and process claims faster. He doesn't seem to care how long it takes for veterans' claims to be processed. I wish he would attend some of our hearings.

If Mr. Miller would stop listening to the rosy reports that the VA is taking care of all the veterans who need care, he would learn that there are thousands of sick veterans trying to get into VA nursing home beds. Yet OMB says that Congress is wrong to fund construction of more VA nursing home beds.

Mr. Speaker, I'm for the space shuttle and I'd like to see scientists do more research. If the Government doesn't fund these areas, it's unclear whether private businesses would do so. But I'm relatively certain that if the Government doesn't adequately fund veterans' health care, no one else is going to step forward and assume this burden. It's a matter of priorities, Mr. Speaker, and veterans don't seem to enjoy very high priority with Mr. Miller. Fortunately for veterans, Congress does not feel the same way.

There follows a copy of Mr. Miller's letter to Chairman BOLAND:

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, May 24, 1988.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the House Appropriations Committee prepares to mark up the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 1989, I would like to outline the Administration's position on the Subcommittee version of the bill.

The excessive funding levels provided by the Subcommittee for programs within the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill and the objectionable language provisions contained in the bill are disturbing. If the bill were presented to the President in its present form, I would recommend that he veto it.

The budget authority provided by the Subcommittee for discretionary programs is \$1.6 billion in excess of the President's request. This increase provides for the expansion of low-priority services, at the expense of reductions to higher national priority programs. The following increases in budget authority relative to the President's request are particularly objectionable:

\$925 million for subsidized housing. The Subcommittee's proposed subsidized hous-



ing program mix would serve 23 percent fewer low-income families in 1989—83,438 versus 108,000 in the President's budget.

\$582 million for EPA sewage treatment construction grants. This excessive funding is not necessary to meet municipal compliance requirements and would fund many lower priority projects.

\$520 million for Community Development Block Grants (CDBG). The Administration proposed \$2.5 billion in BA, but augmented it with a transfer of \$145 million from the Section 312 rehabilitation loan fund account. While the Subcommittee has agreed that Section 312 resources could better be used elsewhere, it does not go along with the President's request to use Section 312 to supplement the CDBG program. Instead, the Subcommittee would transfer a Section 312 balance of \$200 million to Urban Development Action Grants. This will use scarce budget resources to continue UDAG's outmoded "pork barrel" programs despite the clear need to terminate the program.

\$225 million for the Veterans' Administration (VA) to increase staffing by 3,513 FTE beyond that which is warranted. The Administration believes that with its expected increase in productivity, the VA can continue to provide quality and timely delivery of benefits and quality medical care to all veterans expected to apply for care without these increases.

On the other hand, the Subcommittee reduces funds for other programs significantly below the Administration's request, changing the balance among executive branch priorities that were constructed carefully within the limits of the Bipartisan Budget Agreement.

The following reductions in budget authority relative to the President's request are particularly objectionable:

While the Subcommittee's very strong support for the Space Station is appreciated, the general reduction of \$205 million from the Shuttle funds could seriously affect NASA's ability to achieve an adequate Shuttle flight-rate build-up, further delaying national security missions and increasing costs to other programs.

The reduction of \$110 million (over one-half of the funds requested) for NASA's procurement of expendable launch vehicle services will reduce needed access to space for important scientific missions already delayed by at least three years, thus exacerbating the effect of the reduction in Shuttle funding.

The Subcommittee reduces the President's FY 1989 increase for all of the National Science Foundation's proposed research programs by almost 60 percent. Such action will hinder efforts to strengthen the nation's scientific and technological base.

The Subcommittee reduces the request for replenishment of FEMA's Disaster Relief fund from \$200 million to \$100 million. This level is clearly too low and will require a supplemental appropriation just to meet the usual level of disaster payments.

The Subcommittee's \$175 million reduction to the Hazardous Substance Superfund account may prevent EPA from meeting statutory deadlines and unnecessarily delay the clean up of 10-15 sites ready for clean up.

The enclosed material more fully describes these and other funding and language provisions that are objectionable.

I urge the Appropriations Committee to cut the excessive increases in low-priority programs and redirect the funds to the more important national priorities. I hope

that when this bill is considered by the Appropriations Committee, you will use your leadership to ensure that the President is presented an FY 1989 HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill that he can sign.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. MILLER III,  
Director.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (VA)

In total, the Subcommittee recommendation would add \$225 million and 3,513 FTE to the President's 1989 request for the Veterans' Administration (VA). The Administration believes that with its expected increase in productivity, the VA can continue to provide (1) high quality medical care to all veterans who are expected to seek VA care and (2) quality and timely delivery of benefits without these increases.

These objectionable increases include: \$215 million and 2,782 FTE for VA medical care; \$3 million and 601 FTE for the General Operating expenses account, earmarking 590 of that additional FTE to the Department of Veterans Benefits; and \$6 million and 130 FTE for medical research.

In summary, these increases would enlarge the VA's staff beyond that warranted by current services, rather than achieving the staffing reductions and associated dollar savings resulting from the enhanced productivity anticipated in the President's budget.

The Subcommittee would also shift \$12 million from minor construction to major construction and reallocate the funds to different projects in the major construction account. The Subcommittee would add four nursing homes and design funds for a clinical addition in Dallas, Texas, while denying funds for construction of a regional office in Montgomery, Alabama and funding the design, but not the full construction, of a clinical addition in Nashville, Tennessee. The addition of funding for the four new nursing homes will result in permanent increases to operating costs in the out-years of more than \$20 million per year. This is over 50 percent more than it would cost to provide nursing home care in these locations through VA's other nursing home programs. Splitting the funding for the design and construction of the Nashville clinical addition is an inappropriate way to budget for capital expenditures. This action, in effect, would shift the allocation of the \$37.8 million requested for construction of the Nashville clinical addition to be used for construction and design of other projects, ignoring VA's priorities.

#### MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in my position as the second-ranking member that is next to the chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives and the one sole member on the majority side from the State of Texas where emerging from that area is obviously the pattern that sooner of later will be affecting the entire Nation as it has indeed already, but perhaps not as dramatically and as perceptively as

the events transpiring so fast in the State of Texas, my home State. And it has to do with the crisis in the area of our financial institutions, our depository institutions. Particularly at this point, though, I anticipate and pray that I am dead wrong that the situation with respect to the savings institutions will spill over into and impact adversely the commercial banking sector.

Now these crises, these events, are not springing forth spontaneously with no direct cause or relation to what has been transpiring since the middle 1960's. In view of the fact that even before the middle of the sixties; that is, 1964, 1965, I have been speaking out on this very same subject matter, and the time of course is quite hazy and in an amorphous manner because it is always very hard to try to be a prophet in your own jurisdiction or your own balliwick whether it is here in the Congress or back home in the district.

But it was obvious as our commitment to war became more complicated as we went into the late sixties that the impact on our economic future was very definite and, if not anticipated, would end in what I then said would be a burdensome and an uncontrollable inflation so that by the middle of the summer of 1965, in reading over the annual Federal Reserve Board reports, I was very much concerned that it reflected—the report for that year—that we were beginning to allocate in the procurement on the national level for the prosecution of the war in Vietnam, that even though it was not and is not legally considered a war, in effect was a hot and shooting war in which some Americans were being asked and in some cases, most cases then, compelled to serve in areas outside of the territorial of continental United States and not in a declared war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those were two areas that I was very much concerned about. One, my concern about the constitutional ability of a President to impress into service an unwilling American to be sent outside the continental United States against his will in a war not declared. That is, as the Constitution mandates, the exclusive power to declare war resides permanently, inherently, and inseparably in the Congress of the United States. It is not one of those delegable functions, so that in reading the history of the enactment of the so-called first peacetime draft, and believe it or not there is a tie-in between these and what I am bringing up now that is so agonizing in our section of the Southwest United States.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason I want to go back to the roots in order to expand on what the dimensions of the crisis are which nobody seems to

want to give out, particularly the regulatory agencies that the Congress has set up to do that very thing, to be a watchdog and, therefore, not enabling us who think in such ways to prepare and anticipate in order to lessen the impact that is inevitably going to hit us nationally, not just sectionally.

Now in that same year, in 1965, I had raised the issue and had antagonized some of the Presidents, then President Lyndon Johnson. He certainly was not a Republican and was a fellow Texan, and a neighbor, and a great friend and a great leader. But these are areas of basic principle that I firmly believe are crucial to being resolved by the American people, and in our system that means through their representatives because it is a yet to be resolved constitutional imponderable.

Now I made speeches on the House floor, special orders but then there was no television coverage. That is something that happened much later, so I am on the record.

In other words, what I am saying now is not I told you so or in hindsight I am wiser. I am just saying that I wish that what I had said and anticipated had been dead wrong, that my extrapolations, if you want to call them that, my conclusions, my deductions, are based on the fact and the figures as presented by those sources that are supposed to have the facts and the figures. In this case it's the Federal Reserve Board.

□ 1420

So I then sat down and wrote a letter to the President. I suggested that the soft underbelly of our economy was being impacted.

Now, everybody was riding high in those blithe days of the middle sixties. We had fairly stable employment. We did not have this phantom of homelessness now hagridding our consciences, but you could not convince anyone that anybody was really bad off and I guess relatively speaking we were not; so under those circumstances it is very difficult to say, "Let's stop, let's look, let's do now what we can to prevent, not wait until we are in a crisis and then react out of crisis," which usually is not the best way to act.

So I wrote a letter to the President suggesting that he commission his economic advisers, and above all, his administrators in the Department of the Treasury as far as fiscal and monetary matters were concerned.

Also, the international situation seemed to me to be in flux. The United States still asserted quite a bit of international leadership in matters of international finance, but our international currency exchange markets were more or less in a state of flux, minor flux, because we still were oper-

ating under the fixed exchange system.

What was obvious was that with the re-emergence of Europe in a united form, specifically since the Treaty of Rome in the late 1940's and the implementation of that treaty, the statistics I compiled and I will admit maybe in retrospect they could look as having been a little too skimpy, but from the best available resources available to me through the Library of Congress Research Service, I gathered that by 1966 the combined economic dynamic force of the European community had not only matched, but had outreached the United States' so-called gross national product.

Now, we must also realize what we have been through, what this great Nation and society has gone through. It has waged a world war. At the height of that war, that is, 1944-45, we were utilizing 45.6 percent of our total gross national product on the Federal level, which was totally consecrated to waging and winning a war.

By 1948, less than 3 years after the active cessation of hostilities, we had dismantled our military operation. We brought our boys back home, as we were all trying to do, by December, Christmas of 1945, and we got them out of uniform.

By 1948, from 45.6 percent we went down to 13.2 percent of our gross national product used on the Federal level.

I use this in order to illustrate and to argue during these interim decades against those who have been so professionally anti-Government and have wanted to build up the Federal Government to a proportion that truly would have indicated that it was out of control. If in fact the Federal Government was ever allowed to get out of control, these facts I give you ought to provide we certainly have regained our destiny and our control on the part of the people by this quick emaciation of the Federal role from 45.6 percent of our gross national product down to 13.2 percent.

Now, also there were precautionary measures taken because very wisely the leaders of our country then feared the concomitant effect of the cessation of a war; that is, inflation, such as happened after World War I. They did a good job. They maintained economic controls, rent controls and price controls, to level it out.

Now, ironically even during the time of war, the administration's implementation of economic controls was a tough proposition, because as always in the affairs of man, to every degree that we can enact a control mechanism, there will always be some effort to evade that control somehow, and to a certain extent succeed.

So that then comes the result of the investment of procurement that rose exponentially just between the years

of 1963 and 1965. For all my colleagues who are so concerned about budgets and committees having to appropriate supplementals, it was at that point in 1966 and 1967 that because of Vietnam we had one of the first supplemental appropriations for defense or the military on that account.

Today, of course, we have been ironically in the name of reforming the budgetary process, we have really wrecked it and every one of us is well aware we are in dire need of reform, and the reason is the last not one year or even one Congress, but for the last several Congresses we have been traveling on 6-month continuing resolutions.

So that what I am saying is this has been reflected also in this very, very critical area, known as our economic life line area or fiscal as well as monetary area of activity.

Now, when I wrote the letter to the President in 1965, I suggested that the administration reconsider some kind of measured control, because in the soft underbelly of our economy, building and construction, a school district in my area had passed a \$27 million bond issue. By the time they got to building in 1965, the price of materials had increased so rapidly and the cost of labor gone up that the sums raised by bond issue were inadequate to carry out the proposed construction program that the bond issue has envisioned.

Now, the reason was clear. All you had to do was pick up a San Francisco paper and look at the advertisements and you would see full page ads asking for skilled carpenters and carpenters to work where—for the construction of Cameron Bay, which incidentally today is sort of a way naval station for the Soviet ships, believe it or not.

So what I am saying is that when I have been impelled to rise and speak, it is because I can clearly see and conclude from what I gather and the materials and the documentation, that like adding two to two to get four, that is these facts are true, if this documentation provided by these agencies separately, but with nobody analyzing and synthesizing by somebody in this Congress, and I would think those of us assigned Banking Committee would be the prime area of membership, should be either commissioning or within House as far as our meager resources in that respect are concerned to do so, or persuade the administration, as I was attempting to do with a measly little letter.

I was suggesting because this impact was already having this adverse effect, because of the high procurement costs for this material in the prosecution of the war in Southeast Asia, that we revive some of the measures that had been constructed during the Truman administration and the Korean con-



flict, and some of those that had been constructed and erected after the actual hostility termination of World War II, because my premise is that World War II has not ended. We do not have a peace treaty. We still have over 300,000 of our troops in Germany alone. We have 45,000 in Korea. All these are hotbeds of possible crises, but in the meanwhile budgetarily they also have an impact, because if the American people are going to be taxed for what the Congress and the President says is the needed required level to be budgeted, and therefore taxed for "defense," then there has to be a cause and effect on the domestic economic well-being of this country.

Therefore, the policymakers, the Members of Congress who must be the ones as the Constitution charges to select the areas of priority, what should be given priority then? So from time to time I have spoken on that individual element.

In 1966, 1 year after I had written the letter, the President bucked the letter to some lower echelon in the Treasury Department. I never heard from anybody at the economic advisory level and I did not even have so much as an acknowledgment of that letter. So I then drafted another letter and directed it to the then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. I suggested a tax scheme, believe it or not, that I called a nest egg tax. The reason for that was the conclusions I reached after studying minutely what the European or Western democracies had done while they were extricating themselves from the postwar inflationary roller coasters and how they were able to do so, even with the help of the Marshall Plan necessary for them to do so, and that was a tax that would be exacted on the basis of it being placed in a trust so that it would not be used in the regular appropriation process, and therefore spent in the eager hands of those who would spend it for some pet projects. It would remain in trust unless and until an element of inflation, and I forget exactly what percentage of inflation I had fixed in that suggested measure, but it certainly was not anything near what we later had to go through.

The fact remains that I was given even less cognizance by the committee. My suggestion was based exactly on what the western countries had done in Europe and had managed to make it operable and it had worked as intended; in other words, to reserve when inflation rears its head, to use for certain purposes to attenuate that inflation. If the inflation is either placated or reduced, then that money is returned to the taxpayers because it is in a trust fund and can be used only for these purposes of equilibrium. So much for that.

I say that because I have never been one to get up and knock something

unless I had something to suggest in lieu thereof.

The problem was that nobody saw that as a problem at the time.

□ 1435

It was not until 1968 that finally it was obvious that we could not have guns and butter without some additional revenue, and the President then in all fairness, and I notice historians have not noted this and they blame Lyndon Johnson for wanting to have guns and butter, but the truth is in 1967 President Johnson did send a request for a tax increase and Chairman Wilbur Mills at that time said that he did not think that he would so much as call a hearing for that because he had been assured and the President had said that there would not be, and they would not be asking for a tax increase.

Finally in 1968, we had that very little remembered now 10-percent income surtax and it was sunsetted and it was in place for 1 year and then happily it was eliminated. It was obvious that if the Nation is committed by way of priority along a certain course of activity and that in turn is based on what I consider to be a questionable authority constitutionally speaking, what I pointed out was to all of those who at first did not care, but later as the war gained in popularity began to shout and rant and rave, and I never joined that group. I never advocated war but neither did I go around in demonstrations and all because I thought that was just adding to the cacophony and was not at all offering any kind of a creative or constructive suggestion.

I was also speaking in 1967 right here on this House floor when the draft act came up for a 4-year extension and I was the only one that got up and offered an amendment, an amendment that was really unnecessary because it was an integral part of the first peacetime draft act or universal service act. Without that clause that I referred to, that bill would never have passed by one vote in 1941 before Pearl Harbor because it simply said that notwithstanding any of the provisions hereinabove set forth no person subject to the terms of this act shall be compelled to serve against his will outside of the Continental United States except in the case of declaration of war by the Congress, or by specific action of Congress.

So if a President is seeking as Commander in Chief the advice of his chief professional military and he is asking what it will take if we get involved in a certain place as concerns a supply line of 8,000 miles, what are the logistics, the commanders are bound to come in and say that if we have limited manpower and limited ability through appropriations for supplies then this would be our answer

militarily. But they would also say that if we have unlimited sources of manpower then we have another kind of answer.

We have yet to face that issue. It was not until after the extension of the draft for another 4 years in 1971, and incidentally in 1967 when I offered that amendment I could not get three Members to stand up with me to get a vote. But in 1971 by that time there was all of this divisive feeling throughout our Nation which has exacted a heavy toll in our national ethos and in our unity and well-being, but I offered that amendment and got a vote and I got 151 Members to vote for it. The draft act was extended for 4 years but then President Nixon around 1973 discontinued the draft call, however all the apparatus is in place and we still have not addressed the fundamental issue because we do not even want to face the fundamental issue of undeclared wars or twilight wars. All through our history the lesson is clear, a fundamental lesson which is to the extent we stray from our fundamental law, that is the Constitution, we will be, in proportion to that straying, in trouble.

So what has happened in these twilight encounters? President Nixon was not a charismatic leader so it was not hard for the American people to say that we question this, and we question that.

However, then comes President Ronald Reagan who is charismatic because essentially that is his training, to act a role. But in his role as Commander in Chief what has happened is that the Congress has not wanted to oversee or even call for an accounting. Let us take the deaths of the 241 marines in Beirut. They were there for 14 months and some of us were speaking out on this floor for that period of time against that deployment, but most importantly the unanimous advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and these are the most highly trained professional military our country can produce, and to a man they were saying to the President that we are not for that deployment this way.

Did the Commander in Chief heed? No he did not. So we had 241 marines killed unnecessarily.

Then comes the Persian Gulf, though in between we had our Central America where we have had more than 22 of our servicemen killed. What were they doing? They were in undefined missions. Everybody knows the old scriptural saying that if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound who then shall do battle? This is true in the military. The President was mistaking the role of the military with the role of a politician and a diplomat in the case of the Marines being peacekeepers in Beirut. They could not be peacekeepers if they were there interjecting

themselves on the side of one of four parties involved in a conflict.

In Central America, what is the role? What is the military mission? What has been the end result? Catastrophe. Even in the smallest country, El Salvador, after spending over \$4 billion, and we are spending \$1.5 million each day in El Salvador of American taxpayers' money, and we are no closer to any kind of what we would call a satisfactory solution than we were 7 years ago. Surely it is obvious that it is not working and neither is the taxing of the American people with a perverse priority established through happenstance more than through planned activity.

After all of these expenditures and borrowings our country for the first time 3 years ago has become a debtor nation. We have not been a debtor nation since 1914. We were the only creditor nation in World War I and in World War II. Today we are not a creditor nation, we are a debtor nation, and we are the biggest debtor nation.

What is more, we have sold our heritage for a mess of pottage and we have now sacrificed all of that which hundreds of thousands of Americans fought and bled for not in one but in two world wars and we are now an importing Nation. We are now as of 1971 when President Nixon took us off the gold system, and nobody called it that in our American press, but it was a devaluation. I never saw that called that in the American press. The European press did call it a devaluation. All of that adds up because it has its impact on our domestic destiny so that today the institution which does not account to Congress, and does not account to the President though it was created by the Congress in 1913, the Federal Reserve Board which is not a Federal Government entity, it is a private entity. It is owned and controlled by the commercial bank system of the United States, the private banks. In practice it is actually controlled by the seven or eight largest institutions in our country. Is that good? Is that what the Constitution allows? Is that what the Congress intended with the approval of the 1913 Federal Reserve Board Act? I do not think so. No utterance of any Member of the Congress in 1913 and the 2 years preceding enactment of the act ever reflected that.

Why is it now that that institution has escaped an accounting, and the Federal Reserve Board has lost control of its own destiny in such things as controlling interest rates? All through my 27 years on the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs I have had about seven different chairmen of the Federal Reserve Board come up and say how interest rates were an act of God, that they could not do anything about them. Except the last 2 years they finally had frank-

ly said, sure, of course we can control interest rates. We can control them by the margins of deposit assurances, the issuance of interest on your Federal Reserve Board transactions and so forth, and interbank transactions, but we have lost control of that because now the international banking and institutional framework is of such a nature that forces external to our land and out of the range of our control now are determining interest rates then as I have been saying for 27 years that I have been here and I can recall because I remember how difficult it was on June 19, 1966, to point out to the chairman then and to my colleagues what happened that day, that night, when the banks jumped the prime interest rate one whole percentage point. That had not happened even during the Civil War though actually that was a beginning of the formation of our national banking system in 1965 and adoption of the National Currency Act. But interest rates are the mechanism or is the mechanism by virtue of which wealth is transferred within an authority.

□ 1450

I have said ad nauseum here in my presentations since 1966 that from time immemorial interest rates have been at the root of the destruction of mighty empires, that interest rates that permit usurious and confiscating rates on money wreck any country, any economy. How in the world, how in the world can any small businessman in this country afford to pay even 10 percent or more much less 16-17 percent for a loan to inventory his stock in a small business? That is usury. That is not only unconscionable but it is fatal to any kind of well-being of our society, and particularly the economic aspects of our society.

The first shock resulted not immediately after 1966, just like the stock market debacle of this Monday, the 19th of October, but neither did that Friday in 1929 mean particularly much at that moment. I recall vividly, I was working as a little delivery boy and helper for Ernst von Helms, the pharmacist who had the Old Reliable Pharmacy. That was the headline, and all one used to read is a bull market, bearish market. Then they came out and they talked about the stock market crash. Nobody changed then, as nobody much now, although some sectors are, because these things are almost glacier-like in their movements. The impact of the stock market crash and the significance in 1929 really did not hit until 1932.

In the interim year to date, bringing it up to today, in the areas where we have had concomitant forces such as the energy crisis and the rapid destruction of the price structure for oil and gas, we have had, yes, the first big significant shock waves, but we were

going to have them anyway, particularly in my State where, in the case of the savings depository institutions, Texas has a peculiar history of development. Almost every one of the S&L's in Texas have been State-chartered and stock, and there are really only four mutuals. Those are not in particular straits, but that kind of situation made it the happy hunting ground for these predatory, the speculative pirates that ride the main of either Wall Street or the regions in our country that they travel in and take advantage of a made-to-order situation.

Then the Congress compounded with the approval of the 1982 act which homogenized financial institutions, but more importantly, and it was no particular gratification on my part to be the one lone opponent in the committee to that bill that was passed by the House on October 2, 1982. But what it did was provide gimmickry. It set up such institutions as S&L's and others to be enabled to have accounting according to regulatory accounting. One might say that is a lot of gobbledygook. What does it mean? It means very much.

The usual, normal standards of accounting are one thing. Regulatory standards of accounting, as permitted by the Congress, is another, because there intangibles are allowed to become stock and trade of the capitalization structure, so that you look at all of these failed institutions in Texas where the regulators, instead of regulating, have been so cozy in bed with the industry that they not only even did not even bother to wink, they just turned around in a common bed and continued to snooze.

One will see that in trying to put some of these dead corpses together, and what I say is all they are doing is tying all the dead corpses together, and they will just stink more than the individual corpses, and all they are doing is prolonging the cost to the American people, because I am consecrated to the position that as far as one single Member of this Congress or this committee is concerned, I will not idly stand by silent and watch the crisis develop where it will imperil the stability and the well-being and the safety of the insurance funds, not only in S&L's, and if we continue to let the situation go, it is going to spill over into the banking situation.

If there is any banker either in Texas or anywhere else in the United States that wants to indulge in the illusion that it is the S&L's' problem, I have a caution for them: "You will be in the middle of it, and water may go past your nose."

I think now is the time to say, "Well, what is the extent of the crisis?" We cannot get it. I have requested the GAO, and I am going to ask for an in-



terim report next week. I have put facts and figures together up to now, and nobody has disputed them. Oh, yes, there are cries of protest by those that feel I am being critical of them, but I see no rebuttal on the facts and the figures.

What are the facts and the figures? The facts and the figures are that as long as these regulators, and I speak not only to Texas but to other States where they have equal crises, as long as they are holding Federal assurances of a vague kind, because there is no solid cash behind this, these institutions that say they are holding together to try to manage into the light are advertising for funds at such rates of interest that are tending to suck out depositors from the other institutions, banks, credit unions, and the like.

But what is going to happen there? Are the insurance funds adequate? I asked to meet with the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board with respect to the so-called FSLIC replenishment. That is the insurance fund for savings and loans, and what he told me was more disturbing than even that which I had concluded. Then the Senate week before last had hearings on the subject matter and even the GAO came out with about twice the estimate that the Home Loan Bank Board Chairman was telling me.

It does no good for us to deceive ourselves. It does no good to believe, as some would have us believe, that let us just hold things together until November and then after that let us worry about the deluge then, because time and events are not going to wait for that. Even if they wait until the day of election and the night thereafter, all bubbles burst, and we have had not one, we have a giant bubble with a bunch of bubbles inside these other bubbles.

We have had, in my opinion, no less than five money manias since the 1970's; this is why we suddenly are caught by surprise because of the headlines saying "Stock Market." But for how many months had we been saying that bank allocation of credit, that is, allocation of banking credit, was being used wrongly in the light of what the Congress has stipulated is the purpose for chartering banks? That is public need and convenience. So we have these massive takeovers. We have these purely speculative paper transactions, not real stock exchange transactions, reflecting an industrial output or a manufacturing activity or a commercial activity, but paper trading on paper, borrowing on borrowing.

□ 1500

So what we have is a debt bubble of horrendous proportions.

What shall we do, sit here and say no, it is not and then wait until it bursts and then say, oh, well, my good-

ness, what do we do now? Or are we going to let others not necessarily committed to the best interests of the greatest Americans determine that destiny for us?

I think the time to start is here, right now domestically. And in my home State of Texas, even though I have been speaking out before the crisis in Texas, but now Texas is just a laboratory, it is just a little ahead of what is coming nationally. In California we have begun to experience it with the second largest S&L in the country, American Savings of California.

The regulatory agencies, as I said, are so much in bed they are almost incestuous. The Home Loan Bank Board members are the same as the Freddie Mac, that is the Federal Mortgage Association, that is the secondary mortgage market organization for the savings institutions. The board of one is the board of the other.

So the Home Loan Bank Board mandated the Freddie Mac to loan \$5 billion to American S&L's which had already borrowed \$7 billion in the market in New York, Wall Street, and \$2 billion from the Home Loan Bank Board regional office.

Why kid ourselves? If that is the proportion of the problem outside of Texas, when we then take the Texas size problem itself, then it is obvious that unless the Congress comes in and moves before the crisis develops into a total loss of confidence in our insurance funds, then I see nothing but a reaction that will be costly. Every day that these companies that are advertising for deposits, but are dead, stay alive it is going to take that much more money to resolve the problem. But I feel that it is necessary to spread this on the record as I cannot approach it from the committee level since the jurisdiction so far as regulatory bodies are concerned lies in another subcommittee.

However, what worries me more than anything else is housing, shelter, and the long-term fixed mortgages of 30 years. What about these people that are now half term, they are in their 15th year of paying in these institutions back home in Texas? You and I know that when push comes to shove, and you have mostly the small, rural S&L's that still have their portfolios as S&L's were intended to do by Congress for housing and home mortgages, they are going to disappear.

The most disturbing thing from my visit with the chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board was what he dropped almost inadvertently. I do not think anybody in the room really caught it. He said the trouble in Texas is there are too many institutions. In the meanwhile, another member of that same board in the Northeast has been talking about how their plan will work in the region, that is Texas, Lou-

isiana, Arkansas, and that is he says they will end up with 29 mega S&L's in that whole region. Is that good for us? Is that good for America? Is that good for our rural neighbors? Of course not.

This is the crux of the matter. This is what impels me to rise to speak and report that what I have done as one individual Member and as a chairman of the Housing Subcommittee is to begin an appraisal of the size of the housing and home mortgage portfolios in these areas of need, not only in Texas but in the Midwest and in what is known as the Energy Belt and all the way over to the west coast.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEHMAN of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, due to a previous commitment I missed several votes. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted for final passage of H.R. 4505.

I appreciate having this opportunity to state my position on these measures.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GILMAN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of attending a funeral.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COBLE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HORTON, for 60 minutes, on June 15.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, for 60 minutes, on June 8.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, on June 3.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LANTOS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BOGGS, for 30 minutes, on June 9.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 60 minutes, on June 7.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 60 minutes, on June 9.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and

extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MacKay, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COBLE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. BUECHNER.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. RITTER.

Mr. MILLER of Washington in two instances.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. McEWEN.

Mr. IRELAND.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mr. ARMEY.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa in two instances. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mrs. COLLINS.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. WHEAT.

Mr. CLAY.

#### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2969. An act to amend chapter 11 of title 11 of the United States Code to improve the treatment of claims for certain retiree benefits of former employees, and

H.J. Res. 469. Joint resolution to designate June 1988 as "National Recycling Month."

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 7, 1988, at 12 noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3737. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Energy, transmitting the semiannual report for the Office of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 1987 through March 31, 1988, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7138(c); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3738. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of various prospectuses, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4416. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for titles V and VI of the Library Services and Construction Act through fiscal year 1989 (Rept. 100-666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4585. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Taft Institute through fiscal year 1991 (Rept. 100-667). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4638. A bill to amend the effective date provision of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988; with an amendment (Rept. 100-668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAWKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4639. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent abuses in the supplemental Loans for Students Program under Part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes (Rep. 100-669). Referred to the Committee of the whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 3601. A bill relating to the enhancement of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources, the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rep. 100-670, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4365. A bill to designate the Sunderland National Salmon Station located in Sunderland, MA, as the "Richard Cronin National Salmon Station" (Rep. 100-671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4621. A bill to provide congressional approval of the Governing International Fishery Agreement between the United States and the Government of the German Democratic Republic; with amendments (Rep. 100-672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. ROE: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 4417. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal year 1989, and for other purposes, with amendments, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period ending not later than June 8, 1988, for consideration of such provisions of title II of the amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(h), rule X (Rep. 100-673, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. LELAND):

H.R. 4738. A bill to protect and promote cultural survival throughout the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 4739. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise the authority under that act to regulate pesticide residues in food; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4740. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the excise tax on cigarettes by 25 cents per pack and to provide that a portion of the revenues from such increase be used for programs to discourage cigarette smoking particularly by youth; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. APPELGATE (for himself, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MICA, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H.R. 4741. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] payable to veterans with service-connected disabilities and their survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ARMEY (by request):

H.R. 4742. A bill to achieve greater accountability in Federal student assistance programs, to minimize the potential for waste and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. AuCOIN (for himself, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ROE, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. MAVROULES):

H.R. 4743. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to insure certain mortgages for first-time homebuyers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 4744. A bill to improve budgetary information by requiring that the unified



budget presented by the President contain an operating budget and a capital budget, distinguish between Federal funds and trust funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 4745. A bill entitled the "Campaign Contributions Reform Act of 1988"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO (for himself and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 4746. A bill to designate Sespe Creek and the Siskyou River in the State of California as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4747. A bill to designate certain public lands on the Los Padres National Forest for preservation as wilderness and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN (for himself and Mr. WHITTAKER):

H.R. 4748. A bill to amend the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 to provide for drug and alcohol testing for railroad employees; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MAVROULES:

H.R. 4749. A bill to authorize the city of Newburyport, MA, to retain and use certain urban renewal land disposition proceeds; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 4750. A bill to provide a settlement fund for the restoration of certain Indian lands within the Zuni Indian Reservation in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. COMBEST):

H.R. 4751. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for a study of the Coronado Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution calling upon all churches, synagogues, schools, community centers, and other public buildings to toll their bells for 1 minute beginning at 11 a.m. on each Memorial Day holiday; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTINEZ:

H.J. Res. 585. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9, 1988, through October 15, 1988, as "National Job Skills Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H. Con. Res. 311. Concurrent resolution requesting that the next President of the United States continue the practice of holding annual summit meetings with the leader of the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

401. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to Alejandrina Torres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

402. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 593: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 763: Mr. DYSON, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SHAW, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1443: Mr. COURTER and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 1516: Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 1638: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. BONKER, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 2231: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 2532: Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 2789: Mr. MCCREY.

H.R. 3560: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 3620: Mr. FISH, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 3628: Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. KASICH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 3918: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. APPELGADE, Mr. COURTER, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. SYNAR.

H.R. 4007: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.R. 4008: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.R. 4127: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MacKAY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 4270: Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 4308: Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 4446: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 4447: Mr. HOLLOWAY.

H.R. 4463: Mr. SMITH of Florida and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 4474: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. LaFALCE.

H.R. 4486: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 4516: Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 4519: Mr. IRELAND, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. FASCELL.

H.R. 4576: Mr. BUNNING, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 4618: Mr. BRENNAN and Mr. CHAPMAN.  
H.J. Res. 423: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 474: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MACK, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. KEMP, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. BADHAM, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LENT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HILER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WISE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. BATES, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. GORDON, Ms. OAKAR, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CARPER, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. KASICH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.J. Res. 543: Mr. SAVAGE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BONTOR of Michigan, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 544: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HATCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. SCHUEER.

H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. PURSELL and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H. Con. Res. 283: Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. WILSON, Mr. RHODES, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H. Con. Res. 286: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H. Con. Res. 291: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. ATKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H. Con. Res. 302: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FEIGHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. WELDON.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MANASSAS NATIONAL  
BATTLEFIELD PARK

## HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, I introduced legislation to preserve the historical integrity of the Manassas National Battlefield Park (H.R. 4526). Congressman ROBERT MRAZEK of New York joined us in this effort. Today, we have more than 200 cosponsors.

This influx of bipartisan congressional support exemplifies a national concern that Americans have regarding the preservation of our national parks. In addition, this sends a strong proclamation that development adjacent to our most pristine landmarks will not be tolerated.

As you may know, Manassas National Battlefield Park is being threatened by the pending construction of a 1.2-million square foot shopping mall on a 600-acre plot of land on the battlefield. Construction on this historic piece of property will dominate the area's landscape, destroy the integrity of the park itself, and eliminate yet another part of the actual battlefield.

It is our belief that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to preserve the integrity of national parks from the threats posed by the commercial developers. We believe that the preservation of the Manassas National Battlefield Park is crucial in our efforts to maintain and pass on American history, heritage, and national dignity to future generations. Newspaper articles and editorials on the preservation of the Manassas National Battlefield Park have appeared in newspapers and periodicals all over the Nation; below I have drawn together a few of these editorials:

## A HERITAGE IMPERILED

(By Tom Wicker)

Bull Run is a creek that meanders through Virginia so near Washington that members of Congress and ladies of fashion could take horse and buggy out to witness the first battle of the Civil War, fought along the creek banks near Manassas Junction on July 21, 1861.

Confederate victory sent them scrambling back to Washington in panic. After a year of war, no sightseers ventured to the same bloody fields when a second, more terrible battle in August 1862 resulted in Robert E. Lee's most complete victory, the retreat of most Federal troops from Virginia and a forced delay in Abraham Lincoln's planned Emancipation Proclamation.

One of the first postwar acts of veterans from both sides was to return in amity to this dual battleground (Manassas, as Confederates called it; Bull Run to the Federals). Together they erected primitive monuments of local stone on the Henry Hill, where Stonewall Jackson earned his nickname in 1861, and at the Deep Cut, where at

the climax of one of the war's great charges, Jackson's battered defenders threw rocks at Fitz-John Porter's bluecoats in 1862.

A century and a quarter later—in a nation that sometimes seems not to care about, much less honor, its past—the biggest developer in Virginia has been cleared by Prince William County authorities to build on part of the Manassas battlefield a monster shopping mall and a housing development. Heavy new auto traffic, moreover, will suffocate the roadways that give access to the inadequately protected battlefields and their many monuments.

Congress authorized a small Manassas National Battlefield Park around the Henry Hill in 1940, expanded it in 1954 to include some of the second battle sites, then took in much of the rest of the area in 1980. But in a compromise with local authorities, a segment between U.S. 29 (the important Warrenton Turnpike during the Civil War) and the new Interstate 66 was left out of the expanded park, obviously for development purposes.

The excluded area, however, had been in 1862 the site of General Lee's headquarters and the staging area for Gen. James Longstreet's massive counterattack that drove the Federal army of Gen. John Pope from the field. Bounded also by Pageland Lane and Groveton Road, which were important arteries during the battle, the excluded land was of unquestioned historical importance. Its development, moreover, could have great impact on the national park, as Prince William officials recognized.

"The county board of supervisors has absolutely no intention whatever to violate the integrity of that park," Donald L. White, then vice chairman of the board, said twice during Senate hearings on the park bill sponsored by John Warner of Virginia. That may not have been a legal pledge, but it gives what's happening now an even more duplicitous aura.

First, in 1986, the Hazel/Peterson Companies obtained the county's approval for a housing development, an office park, a small shopping center and parking lot, all to be screened by a narrow landscaped strip from the parkland the site abutted. Considerable opposition was heard from local citizens and historical groups, but they succeeded only in scaling down the project (from 975 houses to 560).

But three months ago, Hazel/Peterson announced that it would cut the office park in half, and substitute for the shopping center a huge mall (1.2 million square feet) featuring five major department stores. From the slope in front of Brawner's farmhouse, where in 1862 Stonewall Jackson determined to attack King's Division as it passed on the turnpike below ("the road was blue with them," the Confederate general William C. Oates wrote later), an observer soon will see jammed parking lots and a blight of modern mall architecture.

When Park Service officials protested the sudden switch, which has been kept from the public until it was accomplished, the current board of supervisors fired right back: two parks and the Quantico Marine base, occupying 20 percent of Prince Wil-

liam's territory, provide only \$20,139 a year in Federal payments—but the mall will provide 2,900 jobs and, over 20 years \$135 million in net revenues.

The county may have a legitimate complaint, but is desecrating hallowed ground the remedy? And Manassas is only one example of a national heritage imperiled by development. Stay tuned for a second article, about mounting opposition that may include the House Interior Committee.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1988]

## MALLING OVER THE PAST

(By Tom Wicker)

The Campeau Corporation of Canada, having just swallowed Federated Department Stores Inc., has agreed with the Edward J. DeBartolo Company to spread a new rash of shopping malls across an American countryside that's already in danger of being paved over.

That's bad news that could be worse, if this new retail and real estate giant proves as callous everywhere else as the DeBartolo Company has been in its plan—concealed from the public until recently—to throw down the second-largest shopping mall in northern Virginia on part of the Manassas-Bull Run battlefield.

This 1.2 million square feet of commercial development will put parking lots and fast-food shops on historic ground, where thousands of Union and Confederate soldiers died in August 1862. It will foul the area surrounding and force the widening of roads through the Manassas National Battlefield Park, which the mall will directly abut.

DeBartolo is in cahoots with the Hazel Peterson Company at Manassas, as far as I know, Campeau has nothing to do with that project, which was "cussed and discussed" in a previous article. But commercial development of this kind, all across the nation, already is having an adverse impact on historical, recreational and other sites that ought to be protected as part of the national heritage and patrimony.

Private development is creeping up Marye's Heights—where on a single day in 1863 the Federal Army of the Potomac took 12,500 casualties—to the edge of the Fredericksburg-Spotsylvania National Military Park in Virginia. Historically significant battlefields surrounding Richmond, at Stone's River in Tennessee, and at Sharpsburg, Md., are similarly endangered. At Chantilly, near Dulles Airport outside Washington, where the Union generals Philip Kearny and Isaac Stevens were killed in combat in 1862, housing tracts and shopping centers already cover the battleground.

Nor is it just Civil War sites that are being despoiled. Outside Tucson, Ariz., development is moving inexorably toward the Saguaro National Monument, which supposedly protects the wild desert environment with its giant cactus plants. South Carolina preservationists are trying to raise \$2 million to buy the farm of Charles Pinckney, a signer and one of the architects of the Constitution, to save it from subdividers.

On a strip of privately owned land knifing into Yellowstone National Park, something

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



called the Church Universal and Triumphant has erected a tall game fence that halts the natural passage of animals and violates the park's ecosystem. Private development also threatens national recreational areas in the Santa Monica Mountains of California and along the Chattahoochee River in Georgia.

Nothing yet damages the Custer battlefield near Rosebud Creek in Montana—in its mournful silence and loneliness one of the most moving of all American historical sites. But the National Park Service does not own nearly enough land there to protect the battlefield, should private developers start moving in.

In Loudoun County, VA., a planned housing tract threatens the pristine character of the village of Waterford a designated national landmark that looks today much as it did in the 18th and early 19th centuries. County authorities and the developer still are trying to work out an alternative.

So it goes, without hindrance from the Reagan Administration, which opposes restraints on private property and won't put up the money for land acquisitions to extend the national park system or to protect existing parks, monuments and landmarks.

Now, however, the House Interior Committee is considering legislation that would give the park service more power to prevent damaging development in areas abutting or surrounding such sites. The chairman, Mo Udall, recently took a publicized walk over the threatened segment of the Manassas battlefield; and Representative Bruce Vento, who heads the relevant subcommittee, is optimistic about the legislation.

Increased appropriations for the Park Service's partnership with state historical preservation programs also would help. The service is authorized already to make grants for preservation purposes to these state groups; but the funds available are "bare bones" and their distribution is opposed by the Reagan Administration.

Action now will lock the barn door after a good many horses have been stolen. It's still action worth taking before developers consume what's left of our national heritage.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 8, 1988]

#### IF YOU'VE SEEN ONE BATTLEFIELD . . .

Sometimes it seems that life is just one shopping mall after another. Take, for instance, the 1.2-million-square-foot William Center Mall that is to be built in Prince William County about 20 miles west of the White House and the Washington Monument. But then the mall is only part of it. Ultimately the 600-acre development will include 1.7 million square feet of office space and 650 new homes.

The mall, the brainchild of Edward J. DeBartolo Corp., the nation's biggest builder of shopping malls, will have some competition. Within a 25-mile radius of William Center Mall, according to the Washington Post, there already are three shopping centers. A fourth is under construction. A fifth is planned. The nearest major competitor is the 1.4-million-square-foot, 213-store Fair Oaks Mall.

But there will be something special about the William Center Mall, for on two sides it will be built smack up against Manassas National Battlefield Park, the site of the first and second battles of Bull Run in the Civil War. Manassas is appropriately described by Post columnist Jonathan Yardley as "one of the few pieces of land in America to which the word 'hallowed' applies without reserva-

tion." There in 1861 was fought the first major battle of the war. And there in 1862 was fought a second critical battle that wiped out all the gains of the Union Army in Northern Virginia the previous year. Each time the Union feared for the life of the nation's capital.

National Park Service officials have expressed concern about encroaching development in and around national landmarks of the capital region, especially Manassas. Now their worst fears have been realized. The Park Service has no legal authority to stop the mall—it should have, but doesn't. Local historic-preservation groups vowed to fight the mall, but the deck is stacked against them. The county rezoned the property in 1986 shortly after the real-estate firm working with DeBartolo bought it.

Local officials in fact are delighted as they struggle with neighboring Fairfax County for the region's booming commercial and residential business. "It excites me in the sense that we're no longer going to stand in the shadow of Fairfax County," County Supervisor Robert L. Cole said. "This is going to be nicer than Fair Oaks."

And think of it: a mall with its own national historic shrine.

[From the Houston Post, May 30, 1988]

#### MEMORIAL DAY

This is Memorial Day, the one day Americans set aside as a time for special remembrance and honor of our war dead. No Memorial Day would be complete without at least one orator denouncing our apathy, our forgetfulness, our don't-give-a-damn attitude toward our fallen men and women in the military.

Don't believe it. Americans still care and care very deeply. Look no further than the rolling woodlands outside Washington. There a developer is trying to put up a shopping mall, bigger than the Houston Galleria, right next to the battlefield of First and Second Manassas (or Bull Run, depending upon your accent). Americans from North and South are up in arms over the proposed desecration. In Washington it seems to be generating more angry discussion than the budget, the INF treaty or the summit.

It is another example of American's continuing concern for our warriors on Memorial Day or any day. And, no, it is not weakening.

#### A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO JOSEPH E. O'CONNELL

#### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding man in my district, Mr. Joseph E. O'Connell. Joe will be honored on June 10, 1988, on the occasion of his retirement. I am pleased to have this opportunity to say a few words about him.

Joe O'Connell is retiring after working for General Telephone Co. of California in various positions for 31 years. Joe began working for General Telephone in 1957 as an equipment installer, and it was that year that he started his march to the top of the company. He was quickly promoted to foreman and then maintenance supervisor. By 1968, he was working in

administrative and technological supervisory positions, preparing \$3 million budgets and being held accountable for 100 employees. Since 1978, he has been installation and maintenance superintendent. In addition to this, he has been a part-time instructor at Long Beach City College since 1983.

Besides being committed to his career, Joe has found the energy to give his time to many community organizations. He is the vice president of operation of the Goodwill Industries of southern Los Angeles County, vice president of the Long Beach Kiwanis Club, secretary of the Pacific Hospital Foundation of Long Beach, a member of the advisory board of the Long Beach Boy Scouts of America, past president of the Los Alamitos Chamber of Commerce, a member of the Knights of Columbus and a member of the General Telephone Management Club.

But Joe O'Connell is more than just a glittering résumé. Mr. WALKER, and a 30-year veteran of General Telephone Co. He is committed, sincere, talented and full of energy. His dedication to his work and his community is highly valued by the people of Long Beach. My wife, Lee, joins me in extending our warmest congratulations to him on this auspicious occasion. We wish Joe and his children, Joe Jr., John, Joan and, Lindsay all the best in the years to come.

#### ETHIOPIA

#### HON. JOHN MILLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to protest the Ethiopian Government's interference in the efforts to reduce hunger in Ethiopia.

In 1983 during the last major drought in that region, 850,000 metric tons of food were distributed to the hungry in Ethiopia. Still, over 1 million people died. Today the problem is much worse. In a country of 45 million people, up to 7 million are at risk, with 3.2 million of them in the northern provinces of Tigray and Eritrea. Estimates are that over 1.3 million metric tons of food are needed to save those starving to death in Ethiopia.

But instead of aiding the world wide famine relief effort, Colonel Mengistu has used the country's scarce resources to maintain his own power and on futile attempts to crush the insurgency of the north.

Fuel and planes needed to transport food to drought stricken areas are used by Mengistu's army. So, the food rots in ports, while the people starve. Ethiopia has much fertile land. Yet, the Government's mandate of collective farming and forced communal farms has hurt the family farmers who produce most of the nation's food supply.

On April 6, 1988, all foreign relief workers including United Nations and private organizations, were kicked out of Eritrea and Tigray. All the assets of these programs were nationalized. The Ethiopian Government says they are forcing these organizations out of the north to protect the workers' safety. This is false—rather it is to ensure that all money,

food, and industrial equipment is diverted to aid the largest standing army on the continent.

Assistant Secretary of State Richard Williamson stated in his May 19 United Nations speech that Col. Mengitsu Haile Mariam's actions are ones "which starve an innocent population" and are "cold-blooded neglect of millions of Ethiopians in pursuit of military objectives in an intractable and unwinnable civil war." The Soviet Union continues to aid Colonel Mengitsu in his murderous efforts.

There is one hopeful sign: Recently, United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar received permission from the Ethiopian Government to send United Nations observers to monitor the distribution of food to starving people in the northern provinces of Eritrea and Tigray.

The Ethiopian Government should reconsider and allow the International Red Cross and other famine-relief organizations to resume operations to help the 3 million hungry men, women, and children in the region. I applaud the recent efforts of the Reagan administration to start a major assistance program through Sudan, despite warnings by the Ethiopian Government. The millions of starving people in the rebel-held northern areas of Ethiopia are in desperate need of assistance.

Colonel Mengitsu is taking all the young men, airplanes, fuel, and grain to fight his war against the north. I believe that if the Colonel will end his deplorable actions, then we can again someday call Ethiopia, the breadbasket of Africa.

#### A TRIBUTE TO ANN WATKINS AND ANNE SCHIERDING

#### HON. JACK BUECHNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two great American businesswomen located in St. Charles, MO, who through their hard work, quality products, and creative enterprise were recently recognized by the St. Charles Chamber of Commerce as "Small Business Persons of the Year."

Ann Watkins and Anne Schierding opened Patches, Etc., at 337 South Main Street in St. Charles in 1979. The two had met while restoring homes on Main Street, and decided to move their own business into a narrow brick house originally built in 1870. From there, Ann Watkins brought her professional background in fashion and a family history of generations of quilters, and Anne Schierding brought her professional background in business education and a love of needlework. Together, they created a business sensation, which through creative marketing, not only gave work to 12 employees, but engendered a new interest in quilting and other crafts.

Customers at the shop have come from St. Charles, from St. Louis, from St. Louis County, from Illinois and all over the country, even New York City. Long before they were recognized by their business colleagues in St. Charles or their Congressman in Washington, Ann and Anne were recognized daily by an enthusiastic and continuous clientele, which is

the ultimate recognition for any business, and the true test of efficiency for a free enterprise system.

Anne Schierding passed away Monday, May 30, after courageously suffering through months of Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease, a debilitating brain disorder. Her success in business and in 19 years of teaching at Hazelwood Central High School are in themselves a fitting tribute to a life of success, tragically cut short. We remember her fondly and share that memory and our prayers with her loving family.

But I am sure Ann Watkins will continue in their joint effort, with the spirit of Anne Schierding remaining in the traditional ambience of their store, and in the love for arts and crafts she created among her friends and neighbors, and a number of strangers as well. The living example of Patches, Etc., is the spirit which moves our economy, through which creatively engaged men and women enrich their lives and the lives of others in a responsive exchange of supply and demand. May the work of Anne and Ann not only be recognized for their success and efficiency, but for their love of their work, and the way that love made their customers return again and again.

#### CORONADO NATIONAL TRAIL STUDY ACT

#### HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to introduce a bill that directs the National Park Service to study the Coronado Trail for inclusion in our National Trails System Act. Francisco Vasquez de Coronado was one of the great European explorers of the New World. In his expedition through New Mexico and neighboring States, Coronado was among the first Europeans to see the wide variety of cultural and natural features that make the Southwest so unique. This bill will amend the National Trails System Act to mandate a major study of the approximate route taken by Coronado. The study would lay the groundwork for eventual designation of the Coronado Trail as part of the National Historic Trail System.

Between 1540 and 1542, Coronado led an expedition from the southwest coast of Mexico into the American Southwest in search of the legendary Seven Cities of Cibola. His party of 300 Spanish soldiers and 1,000 Indian allies and servants marched through the present States of Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas. During his expedition Coronado discovered what many believe was one of the fabled Seven Cities of Cibola at the Zuni Pueblo in western New Mexico. He also encountered the Acoma Indians along the Rio Grande River. The expedition traveled north to the Taos Pueblo and east to the Pecos. The large pueblo complex seen by Coronado is still home to the Taos people and can be seen to this day. Coronado met the Hopi in Arizona and the Plains Indians in Texas, Oklahoma and Kansas. Members of

this expedition were the first Europeans to see the Grand Canyon and other Southwestern landmarks.

The study of the Coronado Trail will provide invaluable information to ethnohistorians on the Spanish explorers and the Indian populations living in the Southwest at that time. It will also shed light on this important but sadly neglected era in the history of our Nation.

The study of Coronado's route and the eventual inclusion of the Coronado Trail in the National Trails System will complement the celebration of the 500th anniversary of Columbus's voyage to the New World. Coronado's expedition was the first significant exploration in the American Southwest after the European discovery of America.

Study and designation of the Coronado Trail will preserve an important part of our history and stimulate tourism in the States through which the Coronado Trail passes. Fortunately, most of the sites visited by Coronado and his expedition are readily identifiable and thus can be marked for tourists to investigate and appreciate.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to preserve the most significant expedition route in the Spanish colonization of the Southwestern United States—the Coronado Trail. I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

#### PERSECUTION OF BAHAI MUST STOP

#### HON. JIM LEACH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I join with Congressman PORTER and many of our colleagues this week in introducing a resolution which once again urges the Government of Iran to respect the human rights of members of the Baha'i faith. This House and all similarly constituted parliamentary bodies around the world have a responsibility to make clear that the Iranian regime is accountable for its persecution of these courageous people.

While there have been recent reports of the release of a number of Baha'is from prisons in Iran and while executions appear to have declined, the international community dares not be silent until all such grievous human rights abuses have ended.

Far too fresh in our memories are the executions of over 200 Baha'is in Iran since 1979, the pattern of brutal torture and imprisonment, the desecration of property sacred to members of the faith, and the economic hardships visited upon the Baha'is. The terror which has befallen this vulnerable religious community is unconscionable.

It is important to point out that in its persecution of the Baha'is the Government of Iran carries a legal as well as moral and humanitarian burden of accountability. As a party to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Iran is bound by its provisions to protect religious freedom within its borders, including the right of minorities, in community with like believers, to profess and practice their faith. In addition to breaching international



al norms of decency and civility, Iran's failure to adhere to international human rights standards constitutes outlaw conduct.

Until the campaign of religious persecution and genocide against the Baha'is comes to an end, this body and the executive branch have an obligation to monitor events in Iran, to work with other governments to bring pressure on Iranian authorities to cease their human rights violations, to press the case of the Baha'is in international fora, and to provide appropriate assistance to those fleeing persecution. It is the least we can do for this suffering people who desire nothing more than to worship freely according to their conscience.

## THE CHANGING WATER DEBATE

### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is an old Western saw that "whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting over."

The Members of this body are well aware of that truth about water. This floor has seen some of the most bitter, most prolonged and most contentious of its debates in the last 10 years over the issue of water.

In California, our geographic distinctions have bred differing perspectives on the questions of water development, usage, and pricing. As time passed and the competition for dwindling resources increased—and as unforeseen problems like toxic drainage arose—the debate grew in pitch and intensity.

Yet I believe, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources and as a member whose district is deeply affected by water decisions we make in Washington, that we are building bridges to a more constructive and less polarized water policy for the future. Our delegation has worked on a more cooperative and more unified basis in recent years because we have all recognized the need for a water policy that is fiscally responsible and environmentally sound.

To many, however, water policy remains extraordinarily complex. That is why Peter Milius of the Washington Post has accomplished such an admirable feat: explaining briefly and cogently the political and environmental issues at stake in the continuing debate about the future of water policy.

I commend his recent column to all Members of the Congress:

#### CALIFORNIA WATER FIGHT

California has a ninth of the nation's population and, in dollar terms, produces more than an eighth of the crops. The people and agriculture both need vast amounts of water, but are concentrated in the drier parts of the state—from San Francisco south—where there are only three important sources of the precious product.

The first is an uneven supply of groundwater, already heavily mined.

The second is the Colorado River along the state's southeastern border—but California's share of this is also about to decline as Arizona and up-river states begin to take their full entitlements.

The third is the system of lesser rivers that arise in the state's eastern mountains and come together in San Francisco Bay.

Over the years the state and federal governments have greatly developed this third source, and it now is one of the most ambitious water storage and diversion projects in the world. Upstream are dams whose function is to spread the water over time, capturing excess flow in wet months for release in dry. In the flatlands are two aqueducts—government rivers—to move the water to unaccustomed places. Some is used to irrigate the broad desert valley down the center of the state. The rest is pumped over an intervening mountain range—a trifle in a project such as this—to support the civilization along the southern coast whose center and symbol is Los Angeles.

Now this third supply is also tightening. Population growth is one of the reasons, but the major tension is between environmental groups and agricultural interests. The environmentalists say that too much water is being diverted from the Bay-Delta area, a bog about the size of Rhode Island just east of San Francisco where the mountain rivers intertwine, then flow to the sea. The Delta is itself a prosperous farming area whose shallows and marshes double as important breeding grounds for plant and animal life, including several leading Pacific fisheries.

The water that envelops and supports all this activity is a particular mix of fresh and salt. When the state and federal governments flick on the pumps to move water south, they reduce the flow of fresh, letting salt spread inland. Farming and natural life are both adversely affected; the bay is not properly flushed; and as a political proposition, the interests of the wet northern part of the state are partly sacrificed to the dry, hundreds of miles away.

The critics would restore a more natural balance by recovering some of the water that now goes to agriculture, the larger farmers in the Central Valley particularly. They say the farmers could easily withstand the loss if only they could be made to conserve; five-sixths of the water in the state now goes to agriculture, and much of it is wastefully applied, in part because it is so cheap. The environmentalists point out that part of agriculture's share of the subsidized water is used to produce crops that must then be further subsidized because they are in oversupply—the water is used to grow things for which there is an insufficient market. The redistributionists also note that agriculture compounds the environmental problem by contaminating the excessive amount of water it consumes.

The Central Valley is the most dramatic example of this, as well as of the broader proposition that man only solves one problem in nature by creating another, equal and opposite. The government engineers knew that they would face a drainage problem in some parts of the valley if they transported large amounts of water there. Their cheerful solution was to propose still more construction, of a massive drain to take the water back north to the Delta after it had been used. The Delta's defenders resisted, for fear the used water would be contaminated by agricultural chemicals and the salts in the valley soil, and the half-built drain was allowed to empty into the marshy Kesterson wildlife refuge instead. Then birds at Kesterson began to be born deformed (stunted wings, twisted beaks, single eyes), apparently because the effluent contained too much of the element selenium. Now the drain has been closed, and no one

knows quite what to do. Other water from the aqueducts is filtered through the valley soil into the San Joaquin River, which carries it back north to the Delta—whence some is promptly pumped south again. The valley is stewing in its own salts.

The environmental groups can imagine three ways of prying more water away from the farmers. The first is by fiat: the state is now studying how much water to require be reserved for the Delta on environmental grounds before the pumps can be turned on. A second is to raise the price (which is to say, lower the subsidy) of the government water, on the theory that a price increase will inspire healthy conservation just as it did with that equally basic commodity, oil, in the 1970s. A related third idea is to create a market in water so that urban and other users could buy it away from the farmers. The urban areas in Southern California are now trying to buy some water away from the farmers in the Imperial Valley; they are offering to line the irrigation ditches there in return for the water that would save. The farmers are holding out; they want the cities to pay for the water as well as the ditches.

But sooner or later they will strike a bargain. In California and the rest of the arid West, the politics and economics of water both are changing. The government's old easy-water policies may have made good sense when the state was empty, and the object was to grow. A tighter regimen is coming now that the reverse is true.

## A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO ARTHUR STANLEY SBISA

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to my colleagues' attention the long and distinguished career of an outstanding citizen in my area, Mr. Arthur Stanley Sbis. Arthur will be honored for his 31 years of service as a faithful postal employee at a breakfast meeting on the North Redondo Beach Business Association [NRBBA] on June 9, 1988. This auspicious occasion gives me an opportunity to express my appreciation for his dedicated service to his community.

Mr. Sbis began his career with the U.S. Postal Service in 1957, and has served the people of his community with dedication ever since. He will be greatly missed by all upon his retirement this month.

While dedicated to a career with the U.S. Post Office, Arthur has given an enormous amount of his time and energy to various civic duties. He has volunteered as a foster father with the Los Angeles County Foster Parent Program for the past 23 years. His service to the many young people whom he has helped is an inspiration to us all.

It gives me great pleasure to recognize and pay tribute to Arthur Stanley Sbis on the occasion of his retirement from a long career of postal service to his community. Clearly, Stan's accomplishments highlight the truly remarkable contribution he has made during his long and distinguished career. My wife, Lee, and I would like to extend our gratitude to Arthur for his civic spirit and contributions to

our community, and wish him all the best in the years ahead.

**VLADIMIR AND ASYA KNOKH**

**HON. JOHN MILLER**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 3, 1988*

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, with the conclusion of the summit in Moscow, I want to remind us of the continued abuse of human rights in the Soviet Union. I can think of no better way than raising an individual emigration case—indicative of the still widespread denial of free emigration in the Soviet Union.

When I was in the Soviet Union in January I met with a variety of refuseniks, including Vladimir and Asya Knokh. The Knokhs have been attempting to emigrate since 1975. Mr. Knokh is a radio engineer and has been repeatedly refused an exit visa on the grounds of state security. After first applying to emigrate, Mr. Knokh was fired from his job and was out of work for 9 months. Since that time he has not been allowed to work in this field and has been subjected to harassment by the Soviet authorities. On August 30, 1977, Vladimir was summoned by the KGB for interrogation on his activities and as a witness in the case of Natan Scharansky. Mr. Knokh filed a complaint stating that his treatment and questioning by the KGB was not in accordance with the Russian Republic's Code of Criminal Procedure. But later that fall, Mr. Knokh's apartment was searched by KGB agents and several of his tapes of Jewish music were confiscated.

During the summit, we continued to hear some encouraging words by General Secretary Gorbachev. But the time for words is over; now we await action to fulfill those words. We wait for the Soviets to treat people such as the Knokhs with basic human dignity and to respect their fundamental rights. Until that time, we will continue to speak out for Vladimir and Asya Knokh and for all the rest whose basic rights are being trampled in the Soviet Union.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. JACK BUECHNER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 3, 1988*

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to explain my absence for the votes taken on June 1, 1988. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 159, the conference report to H.R. 1212, the Employee Polygraph Protection Act. I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 160, the Walker amendment as amended by Kildee to H.R. 1801, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, and "yea" to final passage of H.R. 1801, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Due to the incorporation ceremonies of the newest and one of the largest cities in my district, I was unable to be present for these votes.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

##### ZUNI SETTLEMENT FUND ACT OF 1988

**HON. BILL RICHARDSON**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 3, 1988*

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce the Zuni Settlement Fund Act of 1988. This bill will settle out of court two lawsuits of the Zuni Tribe against the United States for allegedly causing, through acts or omissions of the United States, environmental damage to the Zuni Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico.

This settlement is unique in that it provides that the money received by the Zuni Tribe in the compromise of claims will be used for land conservation projects under the control and direction of the tribe. The bill provides for the money to be put into a trust fund, while only the interest on the fund can be spent pursuant to a Zuni Reservation restoration plan to be jointly agreed upon by the Department of the Interior and the Zuni Tribe.

Instead of spending more valuable time and money on trying to determine ultimate responsibility for the damages to the Zuni Reservation in the Court of Claims, the Zuni Tribe and the Department of the Interior will work together at solving continuing erosion problems. By concentrating on the causes of the damage and the remedial measures, both the Zuni and the United States will be enabled to prevent further wasting of Zuni Reservation natural resources.

The Zuni people and the residents of the State of New Mexico will be the great beneficiaries of this far-sighted settlement. I wish to personally congratulate and thank the Governor of the Zuni Pueblo, the superintendent of the Zuni Agency and the Albuquerque Area Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in seeing beyond the flurry of litigation to the extent that they were able to work out a compromise which will be of lasting value to future generations. The environmental concerns which have plagued the Southwest for the past 100 years are squarely addressed.

We envision the Zuni people themselves being the key to the future success of damage control on the reservation. This bill will enable labor intensive projects or reseed-ing and reforestation of the watershed areas to be funded in perpetuity. The building of check dams and other erosion control measures will be closely monitored and supervised with technical expertise provided by the Zuni Tribe and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The genius of the Zuni Settlement Fund Act of 1988 is providing a special fund which will allow the Zuni Tribe to take a proactive roll in protecting the environment of the Zuni Reservation on a perpetual basis, instead of spending the claims money on per capita payments or other tribal programs which have no relevance to the issues addressed by the litigation.

This is an important milestone in the history of the Zuni Reservation which will allow the Zuni people to play the leading role in the restoration and conservation of their reservation resources. The cooperation of the United States and the Zuni Indian Tribe in working to

*June 3, 1988*

protect the natural beauty and productivity of the Zuni Reservation is to be highly praised.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

##### CONGRESSIONAL CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWS

**HON. JIM LEACH**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 3, 1988*

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as a participant in the Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jews, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the plight of Iosef and Olga Latinsky and their daughter Anna.

Since 1979, the Latinsky's have been seeking permission to leave the Soviet Union. However, Soviet authorities have refused to grant them visas and their quest for freedom has resulted in great personal hardship to the family. Both Iosef and Olga have lost their jobs and have had difficulties at various times obtaining the necessary waivers from family members for their visa applications. Most recently, the Soviets have turned down their request for a visa citing insufficient kinship as the basis for doing so. Iosef and Olga also served brief prison terms for demonstrating, for making public their convictions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that Soviet authorities will reconsider their refusal to permit the emigration of the Latinsky's and will allow them to leave the Soviet Union. Although there has been recent improvement in the numbers of those from the Jewish community who have been allowed to emigrate, it is apparent, as the Latinsky case demonstrates, that the Soviets have a long way to go to be in compliance with their obligations under international law.

At a time when serious efforts are underway to improve bilateral United States-Soviet relations in such areas as arms control, it is crucial that progress be made on the humanitarian front as well. A positive response by Soviet authorities to the Latinsky's request to leave the Soviet Union, and to the desire of others in the Jewish community for greater religious freedom, family reunification, and related human rights concerns, will go far in promoting an improved United States-Soviet relationship.

##### GIVING CHILDREN PRIORITY; INVESTING IN CHILD CARE

**HON. GEORGE MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, June 3, 1988*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, over the past 4 years, the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, which I chair, has heard from families in the inner cities and families in the suburbs on the need for a Federal response to the child care crisis.

The facts speak for themselves:



More than half of all preschool and school-age children have mothers who work outside the home.

Nearly three-quarters of mothers who work report that their incomes are vital to their family's economic security.

The shortage of child care presents a major obstacle to welfare mothers who want to work and teenage mothers who wish to return to school.

The select committee has also documented that quality child care benefits children as well as working parents. Child care programs that pay attention to early childhood development—programs similar to Head Start—greatly enhance a child's later academic performance.

Mr. Speaker, as we in Congress prepare to consider the various child care initiatives before us, I urge my colleagues to consider the words of William Raspberry of the Washington Post.

The information follows:

[From the Washington Post, Wednesday, June 1, 1988]

#### CHILD CARE—FOR ALL CHILDREN

(By William Raspberry)

Child care in America is a consensus in search of a policy.

Whether the question is equality between the races and the sexes or welfare/workfare reform, the flood of middle-class women into the work force or adolescent parenting, economic competitiveness or functional illiteracy, a part of the answer is likely to be: child care.

Except for a handful of conservatives who see tax-supported day care as an intrusion into the inner sanctum of the family, and a smaller number of futurist philosophers who doubt the wisdom of pushing women out of the home in pursuit of full employment, there is a growing consensus that child care is a critical element in addressing America's economic and educational woes.

But the move toward consensus has come in such herky-jerky, differently motivated surges that we have neglected to spell out what we want child care to produce or how best to achieve it.

The women's movement sees the ready availability of day care as crucial to the problem of sexual equity. As long as women are expected to see to the care of their children and produce family income, they cannot hope to achieve on-the-job equality.

With black women even more likely than their white counterparts to be primary breadwinners, day care has emerged as an important civil rights issue.

The growing proportion of teen-age mothers and the difficulty of moving poor mothers from the welfare rolls to economic self-sufficiency have made day care a key element in nearly every welfare reform proposal. There are even calls for making day care a sort of cottage industry, providing employment for some welfare mothers while freeing others to go to work.

Predictions of a labor-short American future have some of us looking for ways to bring more mothers into the work force (already more than half of all preschool and school-age children have mothers who work outside the home). And others, like Julie Mabus, whose husband, Ray, is governor of Mississippi, have focused on the link between inadequate day care and adult illiteracy.

But we remain a long way from fashioning a policy designed to meet the requirements of the disparate groups demanding day care.

"Having allowed American child care to be shaped by market forces and the ability to pay," says Lisbeth Schorr in her new book, "Within Our Reach," "we now have a grab bag of arrangements in which the children at highest risk are least likely to get the kind of child care that could reduce the chances of adverse outcomes."

Minnesota's lieutenant governor, Marlene Johnson, having spent three weeks last fall studying child care in Sweden, is calling for the development of a child care policy that "would allow our society to understand its responsibilities to our children and to guide our discussion about program development, employment practices and the general needs of children."

Her model: the Swedish system, which "reflects a commitment to teaching children family values and giving children the sense of being nurtured."

The best child care, whether provided private homes, public housing facilities, work sites or government-run centers, would do a good deal more than simply provide affordable baby-sitting. It is already true (though not yet recognized in public policy) that kindergarten is too late for children from low-income families to start catching up to their middle-class counterparts. Widely available child care facilities with a strong preschool intellectual development component—along the lines of Project Head Start—could go a long way toward closing that gap.

Minnesota's Marlene Johnson says she was "impressed and inspired by the Swedish child care system, not because it is perfect or because we can replicate it here, but rather because it is a system that reflects a society willing to make children a priority."

"In Sweden, the care of children whose parents work or attend school is recognized to be an important responsibility of society."

The American public, after decades of ambivalence regarding publicly supported child care, may be lurching toward a similar view.

Indeed, early childhood development is so crucial to subsequent academic success that education-based child care centers ought to be an option for all children, even those whose mothers are at home.

#### THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

#### HON. JAMES M. INHOFE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to the Civil Air Patrol, a group of patriotic and dedicated Americans. These dedicated people flew 17,787 hours last year and were credited with saving 108 lives. In addition to search and rescue missions, the Civil Air Patrol [CAP] provides assistance to forest firefighting crews, helps stranded and isolated people during blizzards and floods, and transports live tissue and organs for transplants.

In 1985, CAP entered into an agreement with the U.S. Air Force and the Customs Service to support the Government's drug interdiction effort by performing air surveillance reconnaissance flights along the borders of the United States. About 1,100 CAP members

have been trained in the Customs drug mission, and they now fly about half of the Customs Service surveillance/patrol flying hours.

Another mission performed by CAP is to maintain a reliable, nationwide point-to-point ground and air mobile radio capability. This network provides vital communications support to local, State, and Federal agencies during disaster relief, search and rescue, and other emergency situations.

The Civil Air Patrol also pays an increasingly important role in getting young people involved in flying. Last year, CAP spent \$33,000 on solo flight training and orientation flights for cadets: \$8,000 for 53 solo flight scholarships to pay for ground school and flight training leading to solo qualification; and \$25,000 to partially fund the orientation flight program conducted at the wing and unit level. CAP's 52 wings and overseas units provided 6,691 cadets their first flight experience and 7,713 cadets were provided flights number two and three in the ongoing 6-flight series.

By exposing more young people to the fun and fascination of flight, the CAP cadet program helps attract and train the pilots of tomorrow. This program not only assures the continued health and capability of CAP, it could also be a major resource in meeting the increasing demand for pilots in the commercial airline industry as our air transportation system continues to grow.

The Civil Air Patrol was established 6 days before Pearl Harbor was bombed in 1941. Congress granted it a charter in 1946 in recognition of its major contributions during the war, and later gave it the status of civilian auxiliary of the Air Force. It plays continuing and vital role in serving and protecting our Nation, and fully merits the support of the U.S. Congress and the American people.

#### FRANK KNOREK HONORED BY NANTICOKE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

#### HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in tribute to a man who will be honored for his lifetime of community service by the Nanticoke Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Frank Knorek will be honored at a testimonial dinner held on his behalf on Sunday, and I am pleased to join the chamber of commerce in honoring this fine public-spirited gentleman.

The son of Polish immigrants, Frank Knorek was born in the Wyoming Valley of northeastern Pennsylvania and has lived his entire life there. A lifelong resident of Sheatown, he attended Newport High School and King's College before establishing his own insurance business. He has served as the president of many civic organizations, including the Nanticoke Chamber of Commerce, the Newport Chapter of the American Red Cross, the Nanticoke Lions, the Nanticoke State General Hospital, the Nanticoke Knights of Columbus, and the Wyoming Valley Country Club. Mr. Knorek is a charter member of the King's College Century Club and President's Club, and

has served as a member of the Holy Name Society and trustee of the Holy Trinity Church.

Although Frank and his late wife Theresa had no children of their own, they cared about every child in Nanticoke as if it were theirs. My father knew Frank well when he served as solicitor for Nanticoke and he passed along to me some good advice; whenever Nanticoke really needed help, speak to Frank Knorek. After the flood of 1972, the major services of the city of Nanticoke were restored, and the facilities were repaired. But there was no money left for Christmas decorations. Mr. Knorek contributed half of the cost of the decorations on one condition: That no one knew he made the contribution. Later when the city was planning to buy a building to renovate as a center for senior citizens, Mr. Knorek bought the option for the benefit of the city, again on the condition that no one know. He did not want to draw attention to himself. I hope Frank will forgive me for sharing this information now, but the chamber of commerce seems to have caught on to his many good deeds, and I think it is a little late to avoid drawing attention to the community service of Frank Knorek.

Frank Knorek is one of the finest citizens the city of Nanticoke has ever produced, and I am proud to join the Nanticoke Chamber of Commerce in honoring him for his many decades of devoted service to our community.

#### STATUS OF MFO PEACEKEEPING FORCE IN THE SINAI

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in late April, pursuant to Public Law 97-132, the Department of State submitted a report of the status of the multinational force and observes [MFO] peacekeeping force in the Sinai and United States participation in that organization.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some correspondence I had with the Department of State regarding that report and its conclusions concerning the forced 300-person cut in MFO personnel in the field due to budget reductions. The MFO remains an important peacekeeping and peacemaking force and its continued viability is crucial.

The Secretary of State's letter which accompanied the April report as well as the exchange of letters with the Department of State follow. The report remains in Committee of Foreign Affairs files:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, DC, April 26, 1988.

HON. JAMES C. WRIGHT, Jr.,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with Public Law 97-132, I am submitting to you the seventh report on the activities of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) and certain financial information concerning United States Government participation in that organization.

The MFO assumed its responsibilities when Israel withdrew from the Sinai on April 25, 1982. This report covers the period from January 16, 1987 to January 15, 1988. The MFO continues to enjoy the full coop-

eration of Egypt and Israel in the exemplary performance of its mission.

The report highlights U.S. involvement in the MFO both as a participant, supplying troops and civilian observers, and as a financial contributor. The MFO is unique in that it is the only peacekeeping organization whose beneficiaries provide the bulk of its operating expenses. Israel and Egypt each contribute one-third of its costs, while the United States has undertaken to provide the final one-third. (The U.S. contribution and the MFO budget are discussed in the Congressional Presentation Documents on Security Assistance Programs for FY-1989.) You will also note that the Department of Defense (DOD) continues to provide the MFO with extensive logistical support on a reimbursable basis. In FY-1987, the MFO purchased more than four million dollars worth of equipment, spare parts and food from the DOD. The Department of the Army, which is the DOD executive agent for matters involving the MFO, consults regularly with the MFO on logistic problems in an effort to help it obtain its requirements promptly at prices consistent with applicable legislation and agreements.

During this reporting period the MFO reached an out-of-court settlement with Arrow Air and Arrow Air's insurers, ending more than one and one-half years of complex litigation arising out of the December 1985 crash of an Arrow Air DC-8 which killed 248 U.S. soldiers at Gander, Newfoundland. The litigation, initiated by a claim filed by Arrow Air's insurers, confronted the MFO with a potential unfunded liability to Arrow Air of approximately \$135 million. In June 1987 the claim was settled resulting in the termination of all litigation and arbitration matters relating to the Arrow claim and payment to the MFO of \$10 million. The MFO expects to apply the \$10 million toward reimbursement of the U.S. Government for certain statutory costs incurred as a result of the death or disablement of U.S. service personnel, which are attributable to their service with the MFO.

At the annual trilateral budget conference in December, the MFO Director General announced that, due to funding constraints brought on by reduced funding levels, he would be reducing the MFO's annual operating budget to slightly more than \$73 million. He indicated the reduced amounts would be adequate for FY-1988 operations, but would, in FY-1989, require reducing the overall size of the MFO force in the Sinai by 300 troops. Although the proposed reductions are not expected to materially affect the ability of the MFO to carry out its mission, the MFO feels that further reductions would require a fundamental change in its concept of operations.

Both Egypt and Israel remain firmly committed to the peace treaty and continue to rely on the MFO to provide a neutral security presence and channel through which they can discuss a range of bilateral issues on a regular basis. In addition to regular discussions, Israel and Egypt concluded negotiations to reach an agreement on arbitration of the Taba dispute. The arbitral proceedings are currently under way in Geneva and the MFO observation post, established to provide an interim presence in Taba during the arbitration process, continues to function without incident. While on occasion, in the broad context of relations between Israel and Egypt some treaty-related issues do arise, in more than five years of MFO operations there have been none which could not be resolved within the system established for that purpose.

Ten nations (Canada, Colombia, Fiji, France, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Uruguay) continue to participate in the MFO and are expected to do so for the foreseeable future. The routine renewal of expiring participation agreements is an indication of the credibility the MFO has achieved as an international peacekeeping organization. It is, however, the effort that both Israel and Egypt put into making the Treaty work and their willingness to use the MFO as a forum to discuss differences in a cooperative and constructive manner, which has enabled the organization to continue to perform its mission with such quiet efficiency.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE P. SHULTZ.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 18, 1988.

HON. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,  
Secretary, Department of State, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I write with respect to the seventh report on the activities of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO), submitted by you to the Congress on April 26, 1988.

I note particularly the conclusions that the budget reductions are forcing a 300-person cut in MFO personnel in the field. I would appreciate your response to the following questions:

Were other methods of cost reduction for the MFO in fiscal year 1989 considered, other than the proposed reduction of a total of 300 troops from the Colombia, Fiji, and United States infantry battalions?

What are the implications of these reductions for MFO operations?

Your report details the reaction of the Government of Israel to the proposed reduction in the size of the MFO. What was the reaction of the Government of Egypt to the proposed reduction in the size of the MFO?

Given the shortfalls in recent funding for the MFO, are you seeking at this time any involvement of the United Nations in covering costs or providing personnel for the MFO?

Given the shortfalls in recent funding, do you plan further reconfigurations in the structure of the MFO?

What would be the implications of further such cuts in future years on MFO operations?

Given the MFO's clear record of success, how long do you believe the mission of the MFO will be necessary?

Your prompt attention to these questions is greatly appreciated and I look forward to your response.

With best regards,  
Sincerely yours,

LEE H. HAMILTON,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on  
Europe and the Middle East.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, DC, June 1, 1988.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe and the  
Middle East, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following responses are provided in reply to questions regarding the seventh report on the activities of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO), contained in your letter of May 18, 1988:



**Question.** Were other methods of cost reduction for the MFO in fiscal year 1989 considered, other than the proposed reduction of a total of 300 troops from the Colombia, Fiji, and United States infantry battalions?

**Answer.** By emphasizing management efficiencies, the MFO has been able to bring operating expenses down in the face of inflation and a dramatic decline in the value of the U.S. dollar. To stay within its FY-1988 budget the MFO sold excess aircraft engines, deferred some capital equipment replacement and facility maintenance, and reduced flying hours by ten percent. The MFO sought further measures of this nature, but now feels that the practical limits of savings through management efficiency and deferral of maintenance have been reached.

**Question.** What are the implications of these reductions for MFO operations?

**Answer.** The MFO indicates that the proposed reductions are not expected to materially affect its ability to carry out its mission; however, it cautions that further cuts will require fundamental change in its concept of operations.

**Question.** Your report details the reaction of the Government of Israel to the proposed reduction in the size of the MFO. What was the reaction of the government of Egypt to the proposed reduction in the size of the MFO?

**Answer.** Both Egypt and Israel have indicated that they are satisfied with the MFO as it is currently operating. The Government of Egypt accepts the FY-1989 reductions proposed by the MFO as a realistic and appropriate response to the anticipated financial situation.

**Question.** Given the shortfalls in recent funding for the MFO, are you seeking at this time any involvement of the United Nations in covering costs or providing personnel for the MFO?

**Answer.** The Governments of Israel, Egypt and the United States are not currently seeking any United Nations involvement with the MFO. The MFO was established outside of the United Nations framework because the United Nations was not able to undertake the role envisioned for it in the Israeli-Egyptian Peace Treaty.

**Question.** Given the shortfalls in recent funding, do you plan further reconfigurations in the structure of the MFO?

**Answer.** The proposed troop reductions were carefully calculated to have minimum impact on MFO operations. Further budget cuts would necessitate larger troop reductions and would require the MFO to change its operational concepts. The Israelis have indicated that they accept the FY-1989 reductions proposed by the MFO; however, they consider that the MFO has reached a "red line" and further reductions should not be considered.

**Question.** What would be the implications of further such cuts in future years on MFO operations?

**Answer.** The precedent of force reductions driven by financial constraints could put the MFO on a "slippery slope" and could ultimately have an adverse effect on the ability of the MFO to carry out its mission.

**Question.** Given the MFO's clear record of success, how long do you believe the mission of the MFO will be necessary?

**Answer.** Both parties strongly support the continued presence of the MFO. The MFO protocol states "The two Parties may consider the possibility of replacing the arrangements hereby established with alternative arrangements by mutual agreement."

Both Israel and Egypt have expressed satisfaction with the MFO and the role it is playing as they seek ways to improve their bilateral relations. Although the Israelis accept the force reduction scheduled in FY-1989, they would prefer the MFO to remain unchanged for the foreseeable future.

Should you have any further question concerning activities of the Multinational Force and Observers, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

J. EDWARD FOX,  
Assistant Secretary,  
Legislative Affairs.

## **RICKEY KARROLL, AMATEUR BARREL RACING CHAMPION**

### **HON. KENNETH J. GRAY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I don't often insert material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but a special honor was earned by a good friend and constituent, Mr. Rickey Karroll of Thompsonville, IL, when he won the highest points in the amateur barrel racing competition in the United States for 1987 with 72 points on his quarter horse Go Tash Go.

I am pleased to insert an article from the Quarter Horse Journal about the 10-State travels of Rickey Karroll.

#### **GO TASH GO—AMATEUR BARREL RACING**

The first time Rickey Karroll of Thompsonville, Illinois, rode Go Tash Go was in a barrel race. "I had second, but knocked a barrel," he said. "After that I bought him."

Karroll was looking for a horse when he happened to go to a show at the Horse Palace in Missouri. At the show, Karroll saw John and Sheila Ricketts who sell futurity colts and aged horses. He had known "Tash" through them for a few years, and found out that they were willing to sell him.

Karroll had been showing since 1980, and became the lucky owner of Tash, a 1974 chestnut gelding, in 1986. He said his horse is really a proud horse. "He likes to run barrels and wants everyone to get out of his way so he can run. He is a very gutsy horse, he keeps trying and gives it his all."

Going for the high-point wasn't Karroll's intention at first, but being in the top-three was definitely a goal. "I didn't think it was possible until I had seen the results and I was leading. I thought I would see if I could continue in the number one spot, and then about April, I thought it was possible."

Karroll admitted that last year was one of the greatest, but saddest times in his life. "I met several nice and interesting people, but also one of my best friends, Leon Dalton, was seriously injured at a horse show in Louisville, Kentucky. Besides my horse, Leon and all the Dalton family are probably one of the biggest reasons I won this award. Leon took the time to help me with my riding before I had Tash. He taught me everything I know about horses."

Others which Karroll credits much of his success to are his family and his girlfriend, Becky Gray.

During his campaign, Karroll has some interesting stories to tell, including the time when he was trying to make two shows in the same day. "On the way, the cable to the starter grounded against the transmission line. It melted the battery and burnt the

transmission line. Eighty dollars and several hours later, I was on my way and made the show.

Karroll said he never gave up trying to win the high point. He said there were several people in the running, and he fell several points behind in August and September, and was unable to earn any points. "In November, at Evansville, Indiana, I was 15 points behind, and was able to pick up 11 points. Then I knew I could do it. Like they say it's not over till it's over."

Last year, the team placed in several county fairs in surrounding states. They were the winners of amateur barrels at the Illinois State Fair, and qualified for the World Show in amateur barrels. Tash earned his ROM and Superior in amateur barrels, too.

Plans are to show at the World this year. Tash and Karroll are qualified in amateur barrels and are working toward qualifying in the senior division. "I will show him until sold," he said. "I have a stallion that I will be breeding and showing in 1989."

The amateur exhibitor said he's not involved in many other activities. Showing is his main interest. "I put my horses first over most things I do."

## **REFORMS NEEDED FOR STUDENT AID PROGRAMS**

### **HON. RICHARD K. ARMEY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, today, at the request of the Secretary of Education, I am introducing the Department's proposed legislation to address serious problems in our student aid programs. In recent years, there has been an alarming increase in the rate of student loan defaults, a pattern of apparent exploitation of unqualified students by some schools, and a continuing lack of accountability for educational results on the part of schools participating in our assistance programs. These problems, if not addressed, could threaten the integrity and viability of Federal student aid. Reform is urgently needed, and I believe that the Secretary's well-considered proposals should serve as the basis for the discussion of this pressing issue in Congress.

I would like to read for the RECORD the Secretary's letter to Speaker WRIGHT explaining the need for this legislation and explaining its major provisions:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
THE SECRETARY,  
May 5, 1988.

HON. JAMES C. WRIGHT, Jr.,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a proposed bill entitled the "Student Aid Integrity and Accountability Act of 1988." Also enclosed is a section-by-section analysis explaining the proposed amendments. An identical letter has been sent to the President of the Senate.

These reforms are urgently needed in order to address a number of serious problems that threaten the integrity and viability of our student aid programs. Such problems include an alarming rate of student loan defaults, the exploitation of unquali-

fied students by some schools, and a lack of institutional accountability for educational results in the student aid programs. These amendments would strengthen the Secretary's ability to hold individuals and institutions accountable for maintaining the integrity of these important programs. Major provisions of the proposed bill are highlighted below.

#### REDUCING STUDENT LOAN DEFAULTS

This year, defaults in the Guaranteed Student Loan program alone are expected to cost taxpayers \$1.6 billion. Every means available must be used to reduce these defaults, which endanger the integrity and the viability of our student loan programs. The bill would remove the current statutory prohibition against use of the newly authorized rules, such as aggregate loan limits and the prohibition against student loan defaulters receiving further Federal student assistance. To deprive the Government of the ability to enforce these statutory rules in the most effective manner is a mistake. The Administration cannot justify seeking funds for the Data System until this prohibition is removed.

In order to prevent defaults by individuals who have already demonstrated their lack of credit-worthiness, lenders would be required to check the credit histories of all Perkins Loan, Income-Contingent Loan (ICL), regular Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL), Parent Loan (PLUS), and Supplemental Loan (SLS) borrowers over age 21. Lenders would be allowed to charge applicants up to \$25 to cover the cost of such credit checks. Borrowers with poor credit records would be required to obtain a credit-worthy co-signer. The loan access of students with little or no credit history, who would be the vast majority of applicants, would not be affected.

In order to facilitate loan collection, the bill would require a GSL, SLS, ICL, or Perkins Loan borrower to provide his or her driver's license number, and, as part of the school's exit interview, the address of his or her next-of-kin, his or her expected address and the name and address of his or her expected employer after graduation.

In order to introduce a real incentive for lender diligence in GSL collection and default prevention, the bill would reduce a lender's insurance level from 100 to 90 percent. Lenders would thus bear a small share of the financial responsibility for meeting the cost of defaults. Several Federal loan guarantee programs already include such a risk-sharing feature (e.g., FHA) as called for by OMB Circular A-70 for all such programs.

Similarly, in order to stimulate greater default prevention efforts by GSL guarantee agencies, the basic level of Federal reinsurance would be reduced from 100 to 90 percent. Reinsurance coverage would fall to 80 percent or 70 percent—in place of 90 percent or 80 percent under current law—depending on an agency's default experience. Also, in order to make these reinsurance "default trigger" provisions more effective and equitable, the statutory formula which determines an agency's reimbursement rate would be amended (1) to take into account a guarantee agency's collections on defaulted loans, and (2) to apply any reinsurance rate reduction to the next entire fiscal year—rather than applying the reduction only to the remainder of the year in which the trigger level is reached.

#### PREVENTING THE EXPLOITATION OF UNQUALIFIED STUDENTS

Recent studies have documented the exploitation of unqualified students, who are often admitted through vague "ability to benefit" provisions in the statute, by some proprietary schools. These students drop out at an alarmingly high rate, frequently default on their student loans, and otherwise waste Federal grant, loan, and work assistance. In order to curtail such abuses, this bill would delete the "ability to benefit" eligibility provisions, and simply require that all student aid recipients possess a high school diploma or pass a State-approved high school equivalency test. The Higher Education Amendments of 1986 added a number of provisions intended to limit a school's authority to dispense Federal student aid to non-high school graduates admitted on the basis of "ability to benefit" judgments. However, these new requirements (e.g., "counseling" prior to admission and completion of an institutionally prescribed remedial education program before completion of the postsecondary program) are clearly prone to manipulation by schools and, in our view, will not significantly reduce the enrollment of likely dropouts and defaulters—a situation that is a disservice to the students themselves as well as the taxpayer.

#### PREVENTING THE ABUSE OF STUDENT AID

In order to reduce opportunities for program abuse, the bill would allow the Secretary to limit, suspend, or terminate the participation of individuals or organizations that act as agents of participating schools in administering title IV student aid programs (such as recruiting or loan collection agents, general servicers and consultants) when these agents have violated Federal law or regulations. The bill would also clarify the Secretary's authority to take a short-term emergency action to suspend the participation of a school or its agent when Federal funds are at risk.

#### HOLDING SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES ACCOUNTABLE FOR RESULTS

When schools and colleges benefit from and have considerable discretion over the use of campus-based Federal student aid, they should be expected to be held accountable for providing students a high quality education. This bill would tie institutional allocations for the Work-Study and Supplemental Grant programs to institutional success in meeting various student outcome goals.

These outcome goals, which could include, for example, job placement rates, program completion rates and student gains on standardized academic achievement tests, would be set by the institution itself within guidelines established by regulation. Schools that meet or exceed their objectives would be eligible to receive additional funds based on relative institutional need. Schools that do not fully meet their objectives would have their allocations proportionately reduced. This policy would not affect other Federal student assistance, such as Pell Grants and Guaranteed Student Loans.

#### CONCLUSION

I urge the Congress to give early and favorable consideration to this important legislation. The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation to the Congress and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. BENNETT.

#### MISPERCEPTIONS

HON. BOB McEWEEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. McEWEEN. Mr. Speaker, there are lingering misperceptions about the size and scope of America's nuclear arsenal. In light of the recently ratified intermediate nuclear forces [INF] agreement, it is important that we understand the exact status of our strategic weapons.

In Thursday's Washington Post, syndicated columnist Norman Podhoretz detailed a poll taken for the committee on the present danger by Penn and Schoen Associates. The results of the poll are startling.

Fully 75 percent of all Americans believe that the nuclear arsenal of the United States has increased over the past 20 years while another 11 percent believe it has remained the same. These notions come despite the fact that, as measured in megatonnage, the total yield of our nuclear stockpile has declined by three-fourths.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend Mr. Podhoretz's column to the attention of my colleagues:

DO WE HAVE MORE NUKES THAN WE HAD 20 YEARS AGO? GUESS AGAIN

Question. By how much has the American nuclear arsenal increased over the past 20 years?

If you recognized this as a trick question—if, that is, you know that the American nuclear arsenal has become not larger but smaller, much smaller, over the past 20 years—then you are one of the very tiny minority of your fellow countrymen who know what they are talking about when they discuss the arms "race" and arms control.

Thus, in a recent poll taken for the Committee on the Present Danger, Penn and Schoen Associates asked a random national sample of Americans (not in the tricky form I have just used but in straightforward terms) whether the total number of nuclear weapons in the U.S. arsenal has increased, decreased or stayed the same over the past 20 years.

Now, the plain fact is that we have 8,000 fewer nuclear weapons of one kind or another today than we had in 1967. Yet an astonishing 75 percent of the American people believe that the number has increased, and another 11 percent labor under the delusion that it has stayed the same.

As against this 86 percent who are ignorant or misinformed, only 7 percent of the American people are aware of the true situation, at least in general terms. And things get even worse as we examine the poll a little further.

For example, in addition to being asked about numbers, the respondents were questioned about the explosive power of our nuclear stockpile. On this point, 84 percent gave the wrong answers (that it has either increased or stayed the same), while only 4 percent said correctly that our nuclear arsenal is less powerful than it was 20 years ago.

Not even this 4 percent, however, had more than a vague idea of how large the decrease in explosive power has been. In fact, when asked about that, not one of the 802 persons polled, not a single one, picked the correct category of "50 percent or more."



In other words, practically nobody in America realizes that the total yield of our nuclear stockpile, as measured in megatonnage, has declined by about 75 percent—yes, 75 percent—in the past two decades.

Nor have arms control agreements had anything to do with these reductions. They are mainly the result of technological developments that have made nuclear weapons more accurate. Furthermore, such developments would ironically have been prevented if some arms-control enthusiasts had had their way.

Given the abysmal level of knowledge revealed by the Penn-Schoen poll about the trends over time, it is less surprising than it might otherwise have been to discover that very few people in America have an accurate notion of what has happened to our nuclear stockpile during the Reagan administration.

Here again only 7 percent know that under Reagan (and of course without counting the weapons that will be eliminated by the newly ratified INF Treaty) there has been a decrease in the size of our nuclear arsenal.

True, the decline under Reagan (about 3 percent) has been much smaller than was registered in the period between 1967 and 1980. But a decline it still is, and not the increase that nearly two-thirds of the American people imagine Reagan has brought us.

The Penn-Schoen poll did not go into the issue of defense spending. But it is a safe bet that no more than a comparably minuscule number of Americans realize that only 15 percent of the defense budget is devoted to nuclear forces. And how many Americans understand that even the 50-percent cuts in long-range missiles contemplated by the proposed START agreement would amount to only about 2 percent of the defense budget?

Stop for a minute and consider how it has come to pass that so many of us in this country are either ignorant or misinformed on issues that are literally matters of life and death to us all, and that we hear and read about almost every day.

Does the explanation perhaps lie in a lack of education? On the contrary. The respondents in this poll who went to college proved to be more (and on some questions a lot more) ignorant or misinformed than those who had not enjoyed the benefits of a higher education.

The reason for this discrepancy, I suspect, is that the college educated have paid more attention to the clamor about nuclear weapons that has for so long been filling the American air with distortions and out-right lies. By contrast, people who have averted their eyes and ears—either because they thought they would be unable to understand the discussion, or because they found it too unpleasant, or because they had more interesting things to do—have undergone a less thorough course of brainwashing than their intellectual "betters."

Yet even without excessive exposure to the relentless campaigns waged in and through the media against the arms "race," the relatively unschooled have also for the most part been left with three flagrantly false impressions: that the United States has been engaged over the years in a massive buildup of its nuclear forces; that this process has escalated to unprecedented heights since Ronald Reagan became president; and that it is one of the main causes of the growth in the federal deficit.

In the face of this egregious illustration of how hard it is for a simple set of facts to

penetrate the mind of the public against the will of the media, what becomes of the theories of liberal democracy on which our political system is built? What, in particular, becomes of the belief that the truth is bound to prevail in a free competition of ideas? And what becomes of the Jeffersonian faith in the protections that are supposed to be afforded by a well-educated citizenry against the deceptions of demagogues?

## WE CAN STOP LOOKING FOR A COMPETITIVENESS SOLUTION; THE ANSWER IS A COMMITMENT TO QUALITY

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, the following article, "Closing the Quality Gap," by David B. Luther, senior vice president and corporate director of quality at Corning Glass Works.

Corning is doing an outstanding job promoting total quality management, both within and outside the company boundaries. Since Corning committed itself to total quality management, it has rebounded from a position of trouble, due to international competition, to a position of strength and growth. It went from having to almost abandon glass fiber production, due to Japanese competition, to selling glass fibers in Japan and expanding production. And, all due to a dedication to quality.

The U.S. Congress and American industry can learn a great lesson from Corning Glass Works. In his article, Mr. Luther says:

We have learned that workers, at all levels of the organization, are capable of much greater contributions than we ever thought possible. We have learned that the person on the job usually knows more about the job and how to improve it than anyone else in the organization. We've learned, through experience, that the individual, if allowed, can be one of the most powerful forces for improvement.

I encourage my colleagues to consider this article and the ramifications of having our Nation's industries, schools, and Government, commit themselves to quality. We can stop looking for a competitiveness solution; the answer is a commitment to quality.

The following is Mr. Luther's article:

CLOSING THE QUALITY GAP

(By David B. Luther)

Closing the door of a Honda may be more critical to U.S. competitiveness than trade deficits, exchange rates, or trade negotiations.

The sound of a Honda door closing is a function of quality. It sells Hondas. For many buyers, the sound is as important as the price.

Achieving high quality is not a trade deficit issue or even a political issue. It's a work issue, entirely within our control.

It's much tougher than a political issue, because of the change implied for all of the individuals involved. But if we can tackle the work issue, then we can solve a large part of the trade balance problem.

The flow of wealth from America to the Pacific rim has become a popular cover

story subject and topic of Washington conversation. Competitiveness, trade deficits, exchange rates, and trade negotiations dominate the discussion. Some see in the issue the decline of America as an economic leader.

The trade imbalance is also a cause of concern in many companies, which wrestle with the implications of lost markets. In the last five years, the United States has lost shares in both foreign and domestic markets. The loss of domestic markets alone accounts for two-thirds of the \$169-billion trade deficit.

A casual observer could conclude that unfairness is the cause when offshore companies make a profit selling in America while American companies cannot do the same. Restricted markets, agreement violations, and dumping are all charges suggesting that we do not have a "level playing field."

The second conclusion an observer might reach is that the answer must be a political one. Certainly exchange rate stability, tariffs, and voluntary quotas are the stuff of legislatures and politicians. When activity does occur, the focus is political, whether it is Congress threatening protective tariffs or the president in private conversation with Prime Minister Nakasone. The trade problem seems so large that it can only be solved by governments.

This is partly correct. There are some unfair practices occurring, and there are a number of political actions that could have a major impact.

But government action will not be enough, no matter how optimistically one views it. A private sector response is also needed if we are to make the necessary changes.

Much of the trade problem has occurred simply because offshore companies have done a great job. Manufacturers in Japan and Korea and Singapore have paid attention to what the U.S. consumer wants, and in meeting those desires they have focused on detail, reliability, and quality. Offshore companies have demonstrated hundreds of times, in dozens of products and service areas, that quality products can be made and sold profitably.

They have also demonstrated that attention to detail and quality can be achieved at levels that American companies have long considered impossible, or at least impractical. Time and again, foreign manufacturers have been able to supply a well-designed product that does what it is supposed to do, reliably, and continues to do so for a long time.

The fact that American work must be done differently is not news for most U.S.-based companies. The quietest of industrial revolutions has begun; more and more companies are making the changes required to compete on the basis of quality. Ford, IBM, Xerox, Caterpillar, and many other firms have made the attainment of quality a key strategic objective.

Corning is another. Our 28,000 employees worldwide have been taught to strive for error-free work, to spend more time preventing problems than solving them, and, most important, to know what their customers want and then meet those requirements, on time, every time. The concepts are easy to agree to, if sometimes difficult to follow.

Corning is not particularly unique in its approach. Phil Crosby first made the concept popularly known in his book *Quality Is Free*. Many companies, having adopted some form of Crosby's principles, are making major changes in their products, services, and the very way they do business.

The lessons we have learned at Corning imply a partial answer to the trade problem.

We have learned that workers, at all levels of the organization, are capable of a much greater contribution than we ever thought possible. This was especially surprising to us because we prided ourselves on our progressive human-resource practices. But, as a result of changing expectations, we learned that people are willing and able to take on tasks that had previously been reserved for technical or administrative staff.

We have learned that the person on the job usually knows more about that job and how to improve it than anyone else in the organization. We've learned, through experience, that the individual, if allowed, can be one of the most powerful forces for improvement.

One example is a young man whose job it is to silk-screen the measuring marks on glass laboratory vessels, such as beakers and flasks. Corning has been producing and silk-screening laboratory glassware for many years and thought the process pretty well defined. The young man, after performing the job for some time, decided he could improve the process. In fact, with his boss' encouragement, he designed and built a new machine in his basement. The machine was brought into the factory and is now used in production.

The result is increased capacity and a 38 percent reduction in setup time (the time required to change from one product to another). Before the advent of quality, this could not have happened. We would not have believed that a worker with a high school education was capable of such a feat, nor would we have encouraged him to try.

A second example involves the catalytic converter used to remove pollutants from automobile exhausts. Corning invented and developed the product, sold the concept to Detroit, and built a plant to manufacture it. A short time later, Japanese competition supplied a better product at an attractive price.

Threatened by the loss of Detroit's business and 1,000 jobs, a determined Corning plant manager led a rigorous quality drive, reducing the error rate to 30 defects per million pieces made. This averages out to about one mistake per person every six weeks. As a result, we currently have the U.S. business and we now sell to Japanese automobile manufacturers.

People can indeed perform, if management provides the environment that allows them to. They can even make products good enough to export to Japan.

Another lesson we've learned is that people really want to do a good job. People don't want to go home at the end of the day feeling that they have not performed well.

In our environment, training is an important part of quality. Our target is to spend five percent of time worked on training, and in some cases people think we still are not doing enough. In a local glass-tubing plant the workers in one area were distressed by losses that were occurring because people new to their department received no specific training about the operation.

A team of production workers designed a training program, piloted it, and then got union and management agreement that the training be mandatory for anyone joining the department. The program included a video, classroom training, on-the-job training, and a skills-certification process. The people in this plant not only want to do a good job themselves, they want their fellow workers to do a good job as well.

The most popular examples are from factories. Equally relevant, and often a lot more difficult to address, are the areas occupied by administrators and clerical and technical personnel. The environment is different, but the idea is the same.

For example, a team of administrative workers who run and distribute computer reports for international locations decided to economize its function by better assessing customer need. They interviewed everyone to whom they distributed reports and, through consolidation and elimination, got rid of a pile of computer reports that, over a year's time, would equal the height of a two-story building and weigh 500 pounds.

Small stuff? Perhaps, but over time and with a lot of people it becomes a potent force.

It is almost a cliché that we in America are in a competitive struggle for worldwide markets that we pretty much owned following World War II. It is clear that workers in other nations are willing to work very hard for a lot less, just to get a share of the way of life that they perceive exists in this country.

It is also true that a portion of the solution can only be accomplished politically. We do need a level playing field to take care of some of the trade imbalance. Perhaps, through political means, over time we can achieve as much as half of the trade improvement needed.

The other half of the problem has to be fixed the old-fashioned way—by doing more with what we have. Fortunately, we have a lot with which to work. If the experience at Corning is an accurate representation, the United States has great numbers of workers who want to turn out superior products and services, who know how to do it and have the insights to make it happen.

They need wise leadership, able to recognize the potential that's available and the consequences of inaction. They need leadership prepared to manage the change of age-old workplace practices and the problems that such change brings about.

And that is a lot tougher than signing a trade agreement.

#### INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL SURVIVAL ACT OF 1988 (H.R. 4738)

**HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation (H.R. 4738) that will help prevent the further destruction and elimination of cultures and societies around the world. Most of us, regardless of our political leanings, assume that indigenous peoples and tribal societies are bound to disappear—destined to the dustbin of history. Most of us would assume that this process is as lamentable as it is inevitable.

Historical processes do not make small traditional societies disappear. Greed and a lack of understanding, however, do. Such groups are weak and tempting targets to the development programs that they are presumed to hinder or in the name of States that they are assumed to subvert.

There is no reason, however, that indigenous and tribal peoples cannot survive, both

physically and culturally, the rapid changes that contact with expanding industrial societies and economic and political institutions brings.

Seen as impediments to progress and development, small societies throughout the world are facing extinction. Those that survive are often decimated by diseases introduced by outsiders and denied a political voice. Usually deprived of their lands and means of livelihood, they are forced to adapt to a national society whose language they do not speak. Without educational, technical or other modern-day skills, they generally suffer permanent poverty, political marginality and cultural alienation.

As the push to exploit the resources of the Earth reaches the remaining untouched areas of the world, contact with isolated societies is inevitable—but their destruction is not. These vulnerable societies need the benefits of modern life, but to survive they need the ability to choose how much they will adapt and how long the process will take.

Their survival is important for our own; it is imperative that we prevent their extinction. They perceive us as barbaric and strange, too. Yet, not only do we share a common humanity, but we can benefit from each other's knowledge. Indigenous peoples have rich storehouses of information about nature, man and the balanced relationship of the two. From their beliefs about the spiritual world to their traditional knowledge of rain forests, healing and agriculture, these societies provide the opportunity for new interpretations about the world and ourselves.

Toward that end, I have introduced this bill to help indigenous and tribal peoples have as much control as possible over their destinies—to retain their rights and culture as they adapt to the modern world. In this way we can insure that progress and development are by all the people and for all the people.

Accordingly, I invite my colleagues to support the International Cultural Survival Act of 1988 (H.R. 4738) and I request that a full text of this measure be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 4738

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "International Cultural Survival Act of 1988".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

(a) DETERIORATING SITUATION FACING INDIGENOUS AND TRIBAL PEOPLES.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The situation of indigenous and tribal peoples in developing countries is deteriorating world-wide.

(2) Many of these populations face severe discrimination, denial of human rights, loss of cultural and religious freedoms, or in the worst cases, cultural or physical destruction.

(3) If current trends in many parts of the world continue the cultural, social, and linguistic diversity of humankind will be radically and irrevocably diminished.

(4) In addition, immense, undocumented repositories of ecological, biological, and pharmacological knowledge will be lost, as well as an immeasurable wealth of cultural, social, religious, and artistic expression, which together constitute part of the collective patrimony of the human species.



(5) The pressures on indigenous and tribal peoples, about 10 percent of the world's population, include denial of political and civil rights and of opportunities for self-determination, destruction of natural resources necessary for survival, and ethnic, racial, and economic marginalization.

(6) In many cases unsound development policy that results in destruction of natural resources seriously jeopardizes indigenous and tribal peoples' physical survival and their cultural autonomy, frequently also undermining the possibility for long-term sustainable economic development.

(7) The loss of the cultural diversity for indigenous and tribal peoples is not an inevitable or natural process.

(8) In light of United States concern and respect for human rights and basic human freedoms, including rights to express cultural and religious preferences, as well as the United States desire for sustainable economic development, it is incumbent on the United States to take a leadership role in addressing indigenous and tribal people's rights to physical and cultural survival.

(b) **DEFINITION OF INDIGENOUS AND TRIBAL PEOPLES.**—Indigenous and tribal peoples in developing countries are those populations that are ethnically, culturally, or socially distinct from the politically dominant society on the regional or national level. These peoples are often (but not invariably) minorities, and invariably have little, if any, political representation or influence in governments. Many such peoples are marginally integrated into market economies and practice traditional, partially or wholly subsistence-based forms of economic activity. Examples of indigenous or tribal peoples include lowland South American Indians, Basarwa of Botswana and Namibia, Mayan Indians in Central America, registered tribes in India, and Tibetan people in the area traditionally referred to as Tibet (which consisted of the province of U-Tsang, currently administered by the People's Republic of China as the Tibet Autonomous Region, and the provinces of Amdo and Kham, currently in the Tibetan autonomous prefectures and counties in the Chinese provinces of Sichuan, Yunnan, Ganbu, and Qinghai).

#### SEC. 3. PROMOTING AND PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS AND TRIBAL PEOPLES.

The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall ensure—

(1) that United States foreign policy and foreign assistance vigorously promote the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples throughout the world; and

(2) that United States foreign assistance is not provided for any project or program detrimental to indigenous or tribal peoples' rights or livelihood.

#### SEC. 4. BASELINE REPORT ON INDIGENOUS AND TRIBAL PEOPLES.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section and section 5 is to help—

(1) guide future United States foreign assistance and other actions that could affect indigenous and tribal peoples, and

(2) permit United States actions that would assist these peoples.

(b) **PREPARATION OF REPORT.**—The Administrator of the Agency for International Development, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall prepare a report on indigenous and tribal peoples in developing countries. This report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the economic, political, and social situation of indigenous and tribal peoples.

(2) A discussion of the effects of United States bilateral foreign assistance and United States-supported multilateral assistance on indigenous and tribal peoples, including a description of those projects and activities currently being funded by the Agency for International Development—

(A) which have a positive impact on indigenous and tribal peoples, or

(B) which have a negative impact on indigenous and tribal peoples.

(3) A comprehensive strategy for regularly monitoring and improving the situation of indigenous and tribal peoples, including—

(A) a description of the methodology and the guidelines to be used in carrying out the monitoring required by section 5, and

(B) a description of the specific actions that the Agency for International Development proposes to take to improve the situation of indigenous and tribal peoples.

(c) **CONSULTATION WITH NGOS.**—The Administrator shall consult with United States-based nongovernmental organizations with experience in monitoring and reporting on indigenous and tribal peoples, and with other interested persons, throughout the preparation of the report required by subsection (b), but in particular—

(1) in determining the scope of that report; and

(2) in developing the methodology to be used in preparing that report.

(d) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit the report prepared pursuant to subsection (b) to the Congress.

#### SEC. 5. MONITORING REGARDING INDIGENOUS AND TRIBAL PEOPLES.

(a) **MONITORING.**—The Agency for International Development (in consultation with the Department of State), on a regular basis, shall collect information concerning and shall analyze the situation of indigenous and tribal peoples in developing countries, with particular regard to the human rights situation.

(b) **USE OF NGOS.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Agency shall, wherever appropriate, use United States-based nongovernmental organizations with experience in monitoring and reporting on indigenous and tribal peoples.

(c) **ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Following completion of the report required by section 4, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall submit to the Congress, not later than February 1 each year, a report which—

(1) presents the findings resulting from the monitoring of indigenous and tribal peoples carried out pursuant to subsection (a);

(2) updates the information provided in the report submitted pursuant to section 4; and

(3) describes the activities which the Agency for International Development proposes to fund for the coming fiscal year to address the problems facing indigenous and tribal peoples in developing countries, specifying which activities will be carried out by the Agency and which will be carried out by nongovernmental organizations.

## JOHN J. THOMAS NAMED CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

### HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to John J. Thomas of Laflin, PA, who is being honored Saturday by the Wilkes-Barre Lions Club as "Citizen of the Year." This annual award is given to an outstanding member of the community who has made a special or significant contribution to the growth and development of the Wyoming Valley. This year the Lions Club has made an especially appropriate choice.

John Thomas is the 77-year-old president of the Thomas C. Thomas Co. and the Thomas C. Realty Co. For decades he has been active in civic organizations throughout the Wyoming Valley. He is known especially for his efforts on behalf of St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital in Memphis, TN, of which he is a director and a member of the board of governors. He is also active with the Pennsylvania Economy League, the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, the Pennsylvania Society, and the Committee for Economic Growth.

Attorney John Moses, the chairman of the Lions' Club selection committee describes John Thomas as having made a substantial yet unselfish contribution to the growth and development of the business and civic life of Wyoming Valley. Another member describes John as "a saint; basically a very compassionate man."

Many people attain material success, but few have shared their success so generously as John Thomas. He has touched the lives of many unfortunate children and their parents from his work at St. Jude's hospital. John J. Thomas has truly demonstrated that the true wealth of a man is measured by how he spends that wealth to do good for his fellow man.

## TRIBUTE TO GEORGE W. LEHR

### HON. ALAN WHEAT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, some people are blessed with an energy and spirit that seems to triumph over all obstacles put in their way. Such a person was George W. Lehr.

In Jackson County, MO, the young George Lehr was the most promising political figure of his generation, a driving force for political reform who would not be denied the attainment of that goal. His integrity was absolutely beyond reproach; no one commanded more respect and admiration.

George Lehr is gone, but he leaves a legacy in Kansas City—indeed in Missouri and throughout the Nation—that will not be forgotten. His personal strength, his public leadership, and his faith in others will always serve to remind us that no task, no dream, is impossible to achieve. We can always overcome.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a testimonial from the Kansas City Star that sums up the remarkable career of George W. Lehr:

GEORGE W. LEHR

George Lehr had a way about him. He rose to the pinnacle of any chosen endeavor. His successes in politics and the private sector are all the more impressive because Lehr did not engage in the mundane.

Lehr relished a challenge. He launched his political career by joining a reform-oriented movement overshadowed by the old-line factional Jackson County Democratic establishment. At the county level, the remnants of Kansas City's machine seemed invulnerable.

Lehr ran for county collector on the reform slate and defeated the factional candidate in the 1966 Democratic primary. He and other candidates backed by the newly formed Committee for County Progress swept to victory except in one race.

It was virtually the end of county bossism. It also opened the way for the organization of charter government here.

By the time home rule arrived in 1973, Lehr had served as presiding judge for two years. He became the first county executive. It was a critical time for the new form of government; under Lehr it functioned as envisioned in the charter. Merit, not patronage and favoritism, prevailed.

The impact of the reform ranged beyond Jackson County. It allowed the development of young political leaders aspiring for statewide office. Jackson County had had few because the factions tried to stifle all but their trusted lackeys.

Lehr used the new-found platform to run statewide. In 1974 he ousted the incumbent auditor, now-Gov. John Ashcroft, from office. Lehr was considered likely to win the 1976 governor's race, but he did not run.

This created an opportunity for Joseph P. Teasdale, another product of the Jackson County reform movement. Teasdale upset Christopher S. Bond, former governor and now a U.S. senator.

At the peak of his political career, Lehr resigned as auditor and entered the banking business. He was a chief executive officer until 1981. He then took on the awesome job of cleaning up the Teamsters Union Central States Health and Welfare and Pension Funds in Chicago. The General Accounting Office has found that the fund has been run properly under Lehr's many reforms.

His private life was a challenge, too. Lehr was crippled by polio in his teen-age years, which forced him to walk with crutches. His only son died of muscular dystrophy 11 years ago. Lehr had suffered inoperable brain tumors for more than a year, yet continued to work until recently.

Despite his disability from polio, and perhaps because of it, he was a driving force. George W. Lehr, who has died at age 51, had completed what he set out to do at the Teamsters fund. It capped a lifetime of excellence.

#### TRIBUTE TO GEORGE W. LEHR

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Mr. George

W. Lehr, who recently passed away. As I'm sure many of my colleagues are well aware, since 1981 George Lehr served as the executive director of the Central States southeast and southwest areas health and welfare and pension funds. It was under his direction and leadership that the Central States funds were restored to respectability and the pension and welfare benefit security of the thousands of working men and women covered by those funds were protected.

As a native of Missouri, George Lehr dedicated his life to public service, both to Missouri and to our Nation. I commend to my colleagues' attention, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch's glowing editorial tribute to a man who benefited our country greatly and whose untimely death was a loss to us all:

#### A MAN WHO LIVED RIGHT

Occasionally, public figures move through life and leave behind the seeds of legends. George Lehr was such a man. While Missouri state auditor more than a decade ago, he resigned from a promising political career that could have led to the governors' mansion in Jefferson City. He wanted to spend more time with a son dying of muscular dystrophy.

It was a decision that saddened Missouri Democrats as it gave them pride. Mr. Lehr was a politician who, very possibly, could have staved off the decline in electable talent in the state party. A Lehr administration could have introduced new talent to state politics. The impact of his departure is still felt today. But at the same time, no one could argue with the value and rightness of his exemplary choice to put the needs of his family ahead of politics.

Now Mr. Lehr is dead of brain cancer at the age of 51. In a relatively short life, he moved up the ladder of Jackson County politics until he was the first county executive under the new charter. He then moved on to state politics in a race for auditor in 1974, where he beat John Ashcroft, the present governor. His audit of St. Louis remains the best evaluation of this city's operation in memory.

After leaving office in 1976, Mr. Lehr became a Kansas City banker. His most controversial and least understood move, though, was in 1981 when he accepted an offer to be chief executive of the Teamsters Central States Pension and Health Funds. Friends and acquaintances wondered if Mr. Lehr was of sufficiently strong character to end the corruption of the pension fund at that. By virtually all accounts, he was—under the scrutiny of federal agents, who checked his moves and then grew to respect his integrity. Of few people can it be said that they left their world a better place, but for George Lehr, the statement fits exactly.

#### SANDINISTAS CLOSED RADIO CATOLICA NEWS

HON. JAMES M. INHOFE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Speaker, in yet another violation of the Sapoa agreement and the Arias peace plan, the Sandinistas have closed Radio Catolica News for 10 days.

By this action, the Sandinistas violate their promises to protect freedom of expression.

Furthermore, they have timed their action to deny the Nicaraguan people information on the next round of talks between the Sandinistas and the Nicaraguan resistance. These talks currently are scheduled for June 7 through 9.

Mr. Speaker, by defeating even minimum amounts of military assistance for the Nicaraguan resistance, this House has placed its entire reliance on the good faith of the Sandinistas to achieve peace and freedom in Nicaragua. I think it is important for my colleagues to be kept informed of the Sandinistas' record on keeping its promises under Sapoa and the Arias peace plan. To date, their record is miserable.

#### HENRY A. WAXMAN'S STATEMENT IN INTRODUCING H.R. 4739, THE "FOOD SAFETY AMENDMENTS OF 1988"

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, if you ask the American people to express any concerns they have about the safety of their food, time and time again they will tell you they genuinely fear the pesticides we use to produce food. Yes, they want a plentiful, varied, and economical food supply. But they do not believe they have to sacrifice their health in return.

I believe their fears have been exacerbated by the constant flow of studies and reports, like the 1987 National Academy of Sciences report, "Regulating Pesticides in Food," which have criticized our pesticide regulation authorities and efforts. I agree with the criticism in these reports and have conducted a series of hearings on them and on the food safety concerns associated with pesticides since the EDB crisis in 1984. It is easy to understand why the American public is concerned.

I have found the current leadership of the EPA's pesticide program to be dedicated and concerned. They have made major strides in resolving questions about the safety of the older food-use pesticides being used today. However, they are digging out of the deep backlog left by earlier, irresponsible pesticide officials. They are encumbered by inadequate resources and staff. They have not gotten the assistance they need from the Congress.

The legislation I am introducing today amends the EPA's current authority under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act [FFDCA] to set tolerances, or limits, on the amount of pesticides that may remain on food when eaten. This authority is distinct from the basic pesticide registration system under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, which covers all pesticides—including non-food-use and household pesticides—as well as many other herbicides and chemicals. The bill makes many important changes that will clarify and strengthen EPA's authority regarding tolerances for food-use pesticides and will streamline EPA's procedures. I believe these changes are balanced and fair to agricultural chemical manufacturers, farmers and food companies while giving the public



much-needed confidence that a new food safety system is in place to protect them.

The bill is written as a substitute for current section 408 of the FFDCa, but much of current law remains intact. The bill incorporates many of EPA's current practices and is based on the fundamental reforms that has been discussed and recommended by the National Academy of Sciences.

I am including in the RECORD an extensive section-by-section analysis to assist Members in understanding the bill and this complex area of our laws. There are several major features of the bill I want to explain here.

The bill establishes a risk-based food safety standard that is consistent with the other regulatory authorities of the FFDCa—regarding food additives, color additives and environmental contaminants. Using a "negligible risk" standard, EPA would regulate all residues of pesticides in food under section 408. This consolidation of authority removes the regulation of pesticide residues in processed food from coverage under the food additives section (section 409) that includes the Delaney Clause. The Administrator of EPA would be authorized to consider the benefit of using a pesticide chemical in food only under certain circumstances that are spelled out in the bill.

The bill addresses one of the more vexing problems—the older pesticides that appear to have risks far in excess of a negligible risk standard—by allowing EPA to incrementally reduce the high risk associated with certain types of pesticides. Under this special negligible risk rule, the Administrator could allow a new pesticide with greater than a negligible risk to be substituted for an older pesticide that has an even greater risk. While I am always concerned about unnecessary exposure to harmful chemicals, I believe an incremental approach to risk reduction is practical and will improve food safety.

One other important change involves EPA's current lack of authority to require the submission of new data after a tolerance is established if the Agency believes additional data is necessary to assure food safety. This is a glaring omission for any regulatory agency mandated to protect public health.

Under the bill, the Administrator of EPA could require the submission of new health and safety data in accordance with deadlines established by the Administrator. Strict enforcement is provided for, with exceptions to assure that food on which the pesticide was lawfully used prior to the new enforcement actions is not affected.

Mr. Speaker, the changes in this bill are long overdue. It provides important public health protections while fairly balancing the economic interests of farmers and food and chemical companies.

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 4739, THE "FOOD SAFETY AMENDMENTS OF 1988"

##### SECTION 1: SHORT TITLE: THE "FOOD SAFETY AMENDMENTS OF 1988"

##### SECTION 2: DEFINITION

Section 2(a)(1) amends section 201(q) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) to define "pesticide chemical" and "pesticide chemical residue." It adds to the current definition of "pesticide chemical" by specifying that pesticide chemical residues in processed foods, inert ingredients of pesticide chemicals, and substances result-

ing from the metabolism or degradation of a pesticide chemical are included.

Section 2(a)(2) amends section 201(s) of the FFDCa, which is the definition of "food additive," to specify that pesticide chemical residues in processed food and pesticide chemicals used in the production, storage, or transportation of processed food are not food additives, and therefore will be regulated under section 408 of the FFDCa. Food additives are regulated under section 409 of the FFDCa.

Section 2(b) adds new definitions to section 201 of the FFDCa. In conjunction with the definition of "new agricultural commodity" currently in section 201(r), the new definition of "processed food" clarifies that all food to which pesticide chemicals are applied are regulated by section 408.

##### SECTION 3: ADULTERATED FOOD

Section 402(a)(2) is amended to specify that pesticide chemical residues in processed food are regulated by section 408 and that, if the residues in such processed food are within the tolerances set under section 408, the food is not adulterated.

##### SECTION 4: TOLERANCES AND EXEMPTIONS FOR PESTICIDE CHEMICAL RESIDUES

This section contains a substitute for current section 408.

##### Section 408(a)(1): General Rule for Tolerances or Exemptions

This section establishes the general rule that any pesticide chemical residue in or on food, and any pesticide chemical added to food (regardless of whether residues remain), requires either a tolerance or an exemption, and that the residue remaining on food must be within the tolerance limit or consistent with the exemption.

##### Section 408(a)(2): Processed Food

This section specifies that pesticide chemical residues in or on processed food which do not have a separate tolerance are lawful if those residues have been removed to the extent possible in good manufacturing practice and are within the tolerance for the raw agricultural commodity from which the processed food was made.

##### Section 408(a)(3): Effect of Tolerance or Exemption

This section specifies that raw agricultural commodities and processed food that contain pesticide chemicals residues pursuant to a tolerance or an exemption under section 408 are not to be considered "adulterated" (and thus illegal) under section 402(a)(1) of the FFDCa.

##### Section 408(b): General Rule for Tolerances

##### Section 408(b)(1): Authority

This section authorizes the Administrator of the EPA (who is responsible for administering section 408) to promulgate regulations that establish, modify or revoke tolerances either in response to a petition under section 408(d) or on the Administrator's initiative under section 408(e). The Administrator may establish expiration dates for such tolerances.

##### Section 408(b)(2): Standard

##### Section 408(b)(2)(A): Negligible Risk Standard

This section specifies that a tolerance may be established, or left in effect, only if the risk to human health, including the health of identifiable population groups with special food consumption patterns, from dietary exposure to the pesticide chemical or pesticide chemical residue, is negligible.

##### Section 408(b)(2)(B): Special Negligible Risk Standard

This section provides for the only exception to the negligible risk standard in subparagraph (A). Under this special rule, a new tolerance may be established even though its risk is greater than a negligible risk.

In order to establish such a tolerance, the Administrator must first attempt to reduce the risk of the pesticide chemical residue below the negligible risk standard in accordance with section 408(b)(2)(E). If such risk reduction actions do not produce a risk that is less than negligible, the Administrator may establish the tolerance under the following circumstances:

(1) the Administrator must revoke a tolerance or exemption for the same raw agricultural commodity or processed food for a different pesticide chemical that is in use and that presents a risk greater than the risk of the pesticide chemical for which a tolerance is requested; and

(2) there is no other pesticide chemical in use that presents less than a negligible risk and that can be substituted for the pesticide chemical whose tolerance is to be revoked under (1); and

(3) the pesticide chemical for which a tolerance is requested can be substituted for the pesticide chemical whose tolerance is to be revoked under (1); and

(4) the person requesting the tolerance demonstrates (or, if the Administrator is proposing the tolerance, the Administrator determines) that the benefits from the use of the pesticide chemical for which the tolerance is requested clearly outweigh the dietary risk of the pesticide chemical.

##### Section 408(b)(2)(C): Criteria for Negligible Risk

This section specifies how the term "negligible" is to be implemented. Clause (i) specifies that, for pesticide chemicals which are believed to cause or contribute to adverse human health effects only above a certain level of exposure, negligible means the level of human exposure which will not cause or contribute to any known or anticipated adverse human health effects. In establishing the level, the Administrator will include an ample margin of safety.

Clause (ii) specifies that for pesticide chemicals which are believed to cause adverse human health effects at all levels of exposure, negligible means the level of human exposure which could cause or contribute in the population exposed to the pesticide chemical to a theoretical risk (using conservative models) of cancer which does not exceed a rate of one in a million.

##### Section 408(b)(2)(D): Exposure

This section specifies how dietary exposure is to be calculated for purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B). The Administrator would take into account all dietary exposure to the pesticide chemical, including exposure under the proposed tolerance (or the tolerance in effect in the case of a petition to modify and revoke an existing tolerance) all other tolerances or exemptions in effect for the same pesticide chemical, and all other sources of dietary exposure (including drinking water) to the same pesticide chemical.

The Administrator would calculate dietary exposure to the pesticide chemical based on the amount of residue that is lawful. The Administrator would assume that residues are on all authorized raw agricultural commodities and processed food at the tolerance

levels and exposure occurs for a lifetime. The Administrator could deviate from this calculation in two ways. First, the Administrator could use the percent of food actually treated with the pesticide chemical, rather than assuming that all authorized food is treated, if the Administrator has reliable data indicating that the pesticide chemical is only used on a certain percent of all authorized food and that the treated food is evenly distributed throughout the consuming public. Second, the Administrator could use the actual residue levels which occur, rather than assuming that residues are at the tolerance levels, if the Administrator has reliable data indicating that the pesticide chemical leaves residues at a certain lower level. If the Administrator used actual residue levels, he could not leave the higher tolerance in effect, but would modify it to the level of actual residues.

#### *Section 408(b)(2)(E): Risk Reduction*

This section specifies how the Administrator would do the risk reduction required by subparagraph (B). The Administrator would take the specified actions, unless they were not applicable to the particular pesticide chemical, plus any other actions the Administrator determined were appropriate. The specified actions are (1) to establish a tolerance that is lower than the proposed tolerance, (2) to modify or revoke other tolerances for the same pesticide chemical to assure a lower total residue from the chemical, and (3) if the proposed tolerance applies to processed food, to permit the tolerance to apply to such food only if the food is processed with those methods that reduce residues of the pesticide chemical.

#### *Section 408(b)(2)(F): Benefits*

This section specifies how the Administrator would consider benefits when authorized to do so by subparagraph (B). The Administrator would consider the various factors described in the section and would publish the basis for his determination when acting on the tolerance petition.

In addition, the section requires the Administrator to propose regulations within 90 days of enactment specifying how the analysis of benefits will be conducted, the data that will be relied upon, and the factors that will be considered.

#### *Section 408(b)(2)(G): Rules for Levels*

This section specifies, in clause (i), that the tolerance level for a pesticide chemical applied to food could be no higher than the Administrator determines is necessary for the pesticide chemical to have its intended effect. Clause (ii) involves the case of a pesticide chemical which leaves no detectable residue. The Administrator would establish a tolerance at the most sensitive limit of detection of the analytical method for detecting residues that the Administrator approves under subparagraph (H).

#### *Section 408(b)(2)(H): Practical Method of Analysis*

The section specifies that the Administrator may not establish a tolerance until a practical method for detecting and measuring residues is specified by the Administrator after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. (Consultation would occur with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).) The method must be the best available practical method, and it would be practical only if it could be performed by the FDA on a routine basis with the personnel, equipment and other resources available to FDA.

#### *Section 408(b)(3): Factors to Be Considered*

This section specifies the other factors that the Administrator must consider in establishing, modifying or revoking a tolerance for a pesticide chemical. These factors include (1) the probable consumption of treated food by the population group which consumes the greatest amounts of the food or which is most sensitive to the chemical; (2) the cumulative effect of the chemical, taking into account related chemicals and non-dietary routes of exposure; and (3) safety factors that are appropriate for animal experiments.

#### *Section 408(c): General Rule for Exemptions*

##### *Section 408(c)(1): Authority*

This section authorizes the Administrator to establish, modify or revoke an exemption from the requirement for a tolerance in response to a petition or on the Administrator's own initiative. An exemption may have an expiration date.

##### *Section 408(c)(2): Standard*

##### *Section 408(c)(2)(A): Risk Standard*

This section specifies that an exemption may be established, or left in effect, only if the pesticide chemical residue presents no risk to human health, including the health of identifiable population groups with special food consumption patterns, from dietary exposure at any level of residue that could result from use of the pesticide chemical on food.

##### *Section 408(c)(2)(B): Exposure*

This section specifies how dietary exposure is to be calculated for purposes of subparagraph (A). The Administrator would take into account all dietary exposure to the pesticide chemical, including exposure under the proposed exemption, all other tolerances or exemptions in effect for the same pesticide chemical, and all other sources of dietary exposure (including drinking water) to the same pesticide chemical.

The Administrator would calculate dietary exposure to the pesticide chemical based on the maximum amount of residue that could reasonably be expected to occur if the instructions for use of the pesticide were not followed.

##### *Section 408(c)(2)(C): Practical Method of Analysis*

The section specifies that the Administrator may not establish an exemption until a practical method for detecting and measuring residues is specified by the Administrator after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. (Consultation would occur with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).) The method must be the best available practical method, and it would be practical only if it could be performed by the FDA on a routine basis with the personnel, equipment and other resources available to FDA.

##### *Section 408(c)(3): Inert Ingredients*

This section specifies that certain inert ingredients may not have an exemption from the requirement for a tolerance. They are inert if (1) are essential for an active ingredient to have its intended effect, (2) cause or contribute to adverse biological effects in any organism, (3) may have an adverse effect on human health, and (4) meet any other requirement established by the Administrator.

##### *Section 408(d): Petitions for a Tolerance or Exemption*

##### *Section 408(d)(1): General Rule*

This section specifies that any person may file a petition for the issuance of a regula-

tion that establishes, modifies or revokes a tolerance, or establishes or revokes an exemption.

##### *Section 408(d)(2)(A): Petition Requirements*

This section specifies the information and data that must be contained in a petition to establish a new tolerance or a new exemption. The required information includes a summary of the scientific reports respecting the safety of the pesticide chemical and the exposure to the pesticide chemical. The petitioner must authorize the publication of the summary by the Administrator.

##### *Section 408(d)(2)(B): Modification and Revocation*

This section authorizes the Administrator to establish requirements for the contents of petitions to modify or revoke tolerances or exemptions.

##### *Section 408(d)(3): Notice*

This section specifies that the Administrator will publish a notice of the filing of a complete petition within 30 days of such filing. The notice will announce the availability of a complete description of the analytical method for the detection and measurement of the pesticide chemical in food, and will include the summary required in petitions to establish tolerances or exemptions.

##### *Section 408(d)(4): Actions by the Administrator*

This section specifies the actions that the Administrator may take after considering the petition and other available information. The Administrator may publish a final regulation approving or disapproving the petition. In addition, the Administrator may propose a regulation that is different from the regulation requested in the petition. If he proposes a new regulation, the Administrator would provide notice and the opportunity to comment as prescribed in section 408(e)(2) before publishing the final regulation.

##### *Section 408(d)(5): Effective Date*

This section specifies that a final regulation issued under paragraph (4) would be effective upon publication.

##### *Section 408(d)(6): Further Proceedings*

This section specifies the manner in which objections to the final regulation published under paragraph (4) would be considered by the Administrator. Within 30 days after the Administrator's action, any person adversely affected (including a person without an economic interest) would file objections. The person who filed the petition (if different from the objector) would have 30 days to reply to the objections. The Administrator could hold an evidentiary hearing if needed. The Administrator would publish an order describing his actions on the objections. Any new regulation or order would take effect in 90 days or earlier if the Administrator determined that emergency conditions existed.

##### *Section 408(d)(7): Judicial Review*

This section provides for judicial review for any person adversely affected (including a person without an economic interest) by the Administrator's decision. Such review would not operate to stay the Administrator's decision unless specifically ordered by the court.

##### *Section 408(e): Action on Administrator's Own Initiative*

##### *Section 408(e)(1): General Rule*

This section authorizes the Administrator to establish, modify or revoke a tolerance or



to establish or revoke an exemption on his own initiative. Any regulation pursuant to this authority would be subject to section 408(d) (6) and (7).

#### *Section 408(e)(2): Notice*

This section requires the Administrator to issue a notice of any proposed rule under paragraph (1) and provide for at least a 30-day comment period. The comment period could be shorter if the Administrator determined that the public interest required such a period or if the Administrator acted under section 408(j).

#### *Section 408(e)(3): Imminent Hazard*

This section authorizes the Administrator to revoke an exemption, or to revoke or modify a tolerance, without following the required procedure if such action is necessary to prevent an imminent hazard. The Administrator would provide notice of the action and would be required to hold a public hearing within 5 days of receipt of a request (which request was made within 5 days of the Administrator's action) for a hearing. The effective date of the action would not be delayed for the hearing, and would not be stayed while the Administrator's action was being judicially reviewed, and would not be judicially reviewed until after the hearing.

#### *Section 408(f): Special Data Requirements*

This section authorizes the Administrator to request additional data when the data supporting tolerances and exemptions are inadequate.

#### *Section 408(f)(1): Determination of Inadequate Data*

This section requires the Administrator to act if the data contained in a petition (including a petition submitted before the date of enactment) to establish a tolerance or exemption are inadequate to support the continuation of the tolerance or exemption because (1) the Administrator has reason to believe the pesticide chemical presents greater than a negligible risk (based on data in the petition or otherwise available), or (2) the data in the petition do not meet the current requirements of section 408 (d)(2)(A) (iv) and (v).

#### *Section 408(f)(2): Action by Administrator*

This section specifies that the Administrator would require the submission of the necessary data, or would initiate an action under section 408(e) to modify or revoke the tolerance or exemption.

#### *Section 408(f)(3): Submission of Required Data*

This section specifies that if the Administrator requires the submission of data, the Administrator would publish an order in the Federal Register that establishes deadlines for the identification of the persons who will submit the data and the submission of necessary data and reports.

#### *Section 408(f)(4): Deadlines*

This section specifies that if the deadlines in the order issued under paragraph (3) are not met, the tolerance or exemption would be automatically revoked. The Administrator could delay the effective date of the revocation for (1) 12 months to allow food treated (within the tolerance or exemption) before the deadline to be sold, or (2) such other period that is necessary to allow the submission of the data if extraordinary circumstances prevented the submission within the deadline.

#### *Section 408(f)(5): Review*

This section specifies that an order issued under paragraph (3) shall be subject to ad-

ministrative and judicial review in accordance with section 408(d)(6) and (7).

#### *Section 408(g): Confidentiality of Data*

##### *Section 408(g)(1): General Rule*

This section specifies that data contained in a petition is entitled to confidential treatment until publication of a regulation or order under section 408(d)(4), unless disclosure has been made previously, or is allowed by paragraph (2) or section 408(h), or is required by other law.

##### *Section 408(g)(2): Disclosure*

This section specifies the persons to whom confidential data may be disclosed. Congress and employers and contractors of the Administrator are included.

##### *Section 408(g)(3): Summaries*

This section specifies that the Administrator may publish the informative summary required in the petition (under section 408 (d)(2)(A)(i)) and other summaries of the data relating to the proposed or final regulation or order under section 408(d)(4).

##### *Section 408(h): Access to Data in Support of Petition*

This section specifies the procedures by which there can be public access to the health and safety data submitted or cited in support of a petition under section 408 (d). A person requesting review of the data would notify the Administrator and the petitioner within 30 days of notice of the filing of the petition, and would make certain affirmations to the Administrator in accordance with paragraph (2). A petitioner could object to the affirmations. The Administrator would determine whether access would be granted. Review of the data would be solely for the purpose of commenting on the petition. No other disclosure of the data would be permitted.

##### *Section 408(i): Other Regulations*

This section specifies how the Administrator would treat certain section 406(a) and 409 regulations. Section 409 food additive regulations for processed food would be deemed regulations under section 408 only if they meet the negligible risk standard under section 408(b)(2)(A)(i). If they do not meet that standard, the Administrator could establish a section 408 tolerance which is lower than the section 409 regulation and which meets the section 408(b)(2)(A)(i) standard. The Administrator would initiate such action under section 408(e).

##### *Section 408(j): Conforming Actions*

This section specifies how the Administrator would act under section 408 to conform to actions on the registration of pesticide chemicals under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act. (FIFRA).

##### *Section 408(j)(1): Cancellation*

##### *Section 408(j)(1)(A): Revocation of Tolerances or Exemptions*

This section specifies that the Administrator would revoke section 408 tolerances or exemptions for pesticide chemicals which have had their registrations cancelled under FIFRA due, in whole or in part, to dietary risk to humans, unless such revocation had previously occurred in accordance with section 408(b)(2) (A) and (B). The Administrator would act under section 408(e) within 60 days of FIFRA cancellation.

##### *Section 408(j)(1)(B): Delay of Effective Date*

This section specifies that the Administrator could delay the effective date of the revocation required under subparagraph (A) for up to one year to permit the sale of food

treated with the pesticide chemical prior to the cancellation if there is no dietary risk to human health from such food during such period.

##### *Section 408(j)(1)(c): New Tolerances*

This section authorizes the Administrator, when a cancelled pesticide chemical will unavoidably persist in the environment and contaminate food, to establish a new tolerance that permits the unavoidable contamination. The Administrator would review the tolerance every year to assure it was no higher than necessary.

##### *Section 408(j)(2): Suspensions*

##### *Section 408(j)(2)(A): Suspension of Tolerance or Exemption*

This section specifies that the Administrator would suspend section 408 tolerances or exemptions for pesticide chemicals which have had their registrations suspended under FIFRA due, in whole or in part, to dietary risk to humans, unless revocation had previously occurred in accordance with section 408(b)(2) (A) and (B). The Administrator would act under section 408(e) within 60 days of the FIFRA suspension.

##### *Section 408(j)(2)(B): Delay Effective Date*

This section specifies that the Administrator could delay the effective date of the suspension required under subparagraph (A) for up to one year to permit the sale of food treated with the pesticide chemical prior to the suspension if there is no dietary risk to human health from such food during such period.

##### *Section 408(j)(2)(c): New Tolerance*

This section authorizes the Administrator, when a suspended pesticide chemical will unavoidably persist in the environment and contaminate food, to establish a new tolerance that permits the unavoidable contamination. The Administrator would review the tolerance every year to assure it was no higher than necessary.

##### *Section 408(j)(2)(D): Effect of Suspension*

This section specifies that the suspension of a tolerance or exemption would be effective (except as provided for in subparagraph (A)) for as long as the registrations are suspended.

##### *Section 408(k): Fees*

This section specifies that the Administrator would establish fees by regulation that would in the aggregate cover the cost of the functions required of the Administrator under section 408.

#### **SECTION 5: INERT INGREDIENTS WITHOUT TOLERANCES**

This section requires the Administrator, within 90 days of enactment, to establish deadlines for the submission of necessary health and safety data to establish tolerances for the inert ingredients that are described in section 408(c)(3). If the deadlines are not met, the pesticide chemicals containing the inerts would be considered unsafe, except that the Administrator could delay the effective date of the determination (1) for 12 months to allow food which contained the inerts on the date of the deadline to be sold, or (2) for such period as is necessary to submit the data if the timely submission was prevented by extraordinary circumstances.

The order of the Administrator requiring the submission of the data would be subject to administrative and judicial review under section 408(d)(6) and (7).

#### SECTION 6: GENERALLY RECOGNIZED AS SAFE PESTICIDES

This section requires the Administrator, within 90 days of enactment, to establish deadlines for the submission of necessary health and safety data to establish tolerances or exemptions for any pesticide chemicals which, on the date of enactment, do not have tolerances or exemptions because they are generally recognized as safe under section 408 prior to this legislation. If the deadlines are not met, the Administrator would be authorized to issue an order declaring the pesticide chemicals to be unsafe for purposes of section 402(a)(2)(B). The order of the Administrator requiring the submission of the data would be subject to administrative and judicial review under section 408(d)(6) and (7).

Pesticide chemicals subject to this section would not be considered unsafe under this legislation (which requires them to have tolerances or exemptions) solely because the chemicals do not have a tolerance or exemption.

#### SECTION 7: REVISION OF EXISTING EXEMPTIONS

This section requires the Administrator, within 90 days of enactment, to establish deadlines for the submission of necessary health and safety data to establish tolerances or to continue the exemptions. If the deadlines are not met, the exemptions would be automatically revoked, except that the Administrator could delay the effective date of the revocation for (1) 12 months to allow food treated in accordance with the exemption to be sold, or (2) such other period as is necessary to allow the submission of the data if extraordinary circumstances prevented the submission within the deadline.

The order of the Administrator would be subject to administrative and judicial review under section 408(d)(6) and (7).

### SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

#### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to designate two wild and scenic rivers, establish two new wilderness areas and expand an existing wilderness within the Los Padres National Forest. The legislation would implement key recommendations of the U.S. Forest Service following completion of the final management plan for the Los Padres National Forest. I am pleased to sponsor these bills which will protect and preserve these outstanding natural and scenic resources for the enjoyment of future generations.

The first bill would add portions of the Sespe Creek and the Siquoc River to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. As proposed by the Forest Service, the 27.5-mile segment of the Sespe Creek extending from its junction with Trout Creek just east of the popular Lions Campground to the Devil's Gate Area north of Fillmore would be designated as a wild river. As the river winds through the national forest, it offers numerous scenic and recreational opportunities. Many varieties of plants and trees can be found along the river's banks, including willow and sycamore.

The unique landscape also serves as important habitat for several species of birds and mammals, including beavers. The 53,000-acre Sespe condor sanctuary is located on lands adjacent to the river and protects critical nesting and roosting habitat for the endangered California condor. The Sespe is also known as an excellent trout fishery and a portion of the river was recently designated as a State wild trout stream. Recreational activities along the Sespe include swimming, camping, hiking, horseback riding and fishing. Several trails parallel or cross the river at various points.

This portion of the Sespe Creek lies entirely within an area of the Los Padres Forest I am proposing for wilderness. This dual designation would serve to protect the many outstanding features of the river.

The 31-mile segment of the Siquoc River flows entirely through the San Rafael Wilderness and would therefore be designated as a wild river. It is known for its recreational opportunities, including hiking, horseback riding and fishing which are enhanced by a foot and equestrian trail paralleling the entire length of the river.

The Siquoc flows through diverse terrain, including rugged and rocky slopes, dense chaparral and several small meadows. Deer, black bear, and several other species of wildlife can be found along the river. The upper reaches of the river border the Siquoc condor sanctuary and provide critical bathing and roosting habitat for the endangered condor. Several cultural sites are also located along the river, including remnants of early homesteads and Chumash Indian villages.

The Sespe and Siquoc Rivers deserve the protection this legislation will afford. The second bill I am introducing today would establish the Sespe and Matilija Wilderness Areas and expand the existing San Rafael Wilderness.

The proposed 197,000-acre Sespe Wilderness begins just east of the Dick Smith Wilderness which was established largely through my efforts with passage of the 1984 California Wilderness Act. This area is characterized by rugged and diverse topography and serves as a major watershed for the Piru, Sespe and Cuyama Rivers. Although the wilderness lies almost entirely within the Los Padres National Forest, a small portion of it extends into the adjacent Angeles National Forest.

The Sespe area is known for its unique natural and geologic features, including Topatopa Mountain, Sespe Hot Springs and the Pristine Sespe condor sanctuary. Wilderness designation for the sanctuary will provide even stronger protection for this critical habitat. The Sespe also serves as an important habitat for other sensitive bird and animal species, including the recently reintroduced bighorn sheep.

Nature study, fishing and hunting are popular recreational activities in this area. Numerous trails through the area and several trail camps enhance other activities such as cross-country hiking and backpacking. Recreational access to the Sespe Hot Springs would be allowed to continue via the Johnston Ridge Trail pending completion of a study by the Forest Service to determine appropriate future management of the area.

My legislation would also establish the Matilija Wilderness encompassing 30,000 acres in the Santa Ynez Mountains. This region is noted for its steep canyons and rugged chaparral-covered slopes. It was extensively burned during the Wheeler fire of 1985 and is currently an excellent example of a recovering southern California chaparral ecosystem. The Matilija provides habitat for numerous animal species including deer, bear, mountain lion, bobcat and fox, as well as the California condor.

Finally, my bill would establish the La Brea addition to the San Rafael Wilderness. The 16,500-acre addition would extend westerly along the southern slopes of the Sierra Madre Mountains, bringing the total acreage of this wilderness to approximately 167,500 acres. The proposed addition encompasses the entire Horse Canyon watershed to its junction with the Siquoc River.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative package I am introducing today represents a comprehensive and far-reaching addition to the National Wilderness System and the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. It will preserve and protect in perpetuity some of our most serene and secluded canyons, rivers and peaks. In addition, by virtue of their close proximity to the urban areas of southern California, these resources will provide numerous diverse recreational opportunities to meet the demands of an ever increasing population. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support this important legislation.

#### A TRIBUTE TO BISHOP L. ROBINSON

#### HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to honor an outstanding citizen of Baltimore, Secretary Bishop L. Robinson. Mr. Robinson will be honored at the Victorine Q. Adams Humanitarian Award Dinner on June 9, 1988. This event presents the opportunity for me to express my sincere appreciation for the many years of service he has given to our community and State.

Growing up during a period of economic and social unrest in our Nation, Mr. Robinson overcame numerous obstacles and pursued his aspirations to become one of the State's most respected citizens, and its top law enforcement official.

He began his elementary education in the public school system of Baltimore. After receiving a bachelor of science degree in Police Administration from the University of Baltimore, Mr. Robinson went on to pursue a master of education degree from Coppin State College and a Certificate in Police Science and Administration from the University of Louisville. The University of Baltimore later awarded him an honorary doctor of laws degree. Robinson has attended a number of professional training institutions throughout the Nation and is also a graduate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Executive Institute.



Mr. Robinson began his career in 1952 as a foot patrol officer for the Baltimore Police Department and worked his way up through the ranks. In July 1984, he was appointed Police Commissioner by then Mayor William Donald Schaefer and provided the community with a strong and responsive police force. Under Commissioner Robinson's leadership, our law enforcement officers worked diligently to ensure that our city was safe for us all. I sincerely thank Mr. Robinson and the officers that served with him for their invaluable service. After 35 years of proven leadership and dedicated work with the Baltimore Police Department, he retired.

While committed to a public service career, Mr. Robinson still devoted an enormous amount of time to the community. He was an adjunct professor of criminal justice at Coppin State College. In addition, he has lectured at numerous universities and colleges throughout the country. As one of the original founders and president of Black Law Enforcement Executives [NOBLE], he displayed dynamic leadership in building a distinguished organization.

Gov. William Donald Schaefer recognized Mr. Robinson's abilities and appointed him to the position of Secretary for the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services on March 12, 1987.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure in taking this opportunity to honor Secretary Bishop L. Robinson for his outstanding career and unselfish service to the State of Maryland and our Nation. He is an American role model we all can be proud of.

#### JOHN SMITH: LEADING THE WAY

#### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on May 20th, John Smith, one of north Dade's leading citizens, was honored at the 14th annual Dade County Schools Volunteer Recognition Ceremony. As the essential, ultimate volunteer, John's award was most deserved.

John Smith is the kind of volunteer who does a lot more than just help out. He is an activist who makes things happen. His vision, energy and ability has made a substantial difference in north Dade's parks, recreation, transportation, education, and business.

His activities for the benefit of our community are legend. As chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, I know first-hand that the south Florida tri-county commuter rail system would never have happened without his leadership and dedication.

We have some special people in our community, but no one like John Smith. He's truly one of a kind, and we are lucky to have him. I would like to share with my colleagues an article that appeared in the Miami Herald which describes some of his other achievements.

The article follows:

[From the Miami Herald, May 29, 1988]

FOR LEADING VOLUNTEER, HONORS COME HIS WAY—DADE SCHOOLS HAIL MAN WHO AIDS KIDS

(By Jeffrey Kleinman)

John Smith's office is full of awards. About 80 of them. All recognizing the quintessential volunteer.

"It's my hobby," said Smith, the manager of the Cloverleaf Bowling Lanes in North Dade. "Some people would rather play golf. I volunteer."

Smith, in his 70s, does most of his volunteering for Dade County public school students. Representing Cloverleaf, he does out awards, conducts rap sessions and opens up the lanes for achievers.

For his efforts during the past year, the Dade school system honored Smith and 146 others Thursday morning at the 14th annual School Volunteers Recognition Ceremony. The honor was for volunteers who worked at least 150 hours last year.

There are 14,000 school volunteers in the county, said Carol Renick, director of the school system's Department of Community Participation.

"John Smith as a volunteer has made a world of difference," she said. "He's lent an extra hand to the teachers and created the one-on-one rapport so often missing because of classroom size."

Smith also was singled out at the ceremony as a southeastern regional finalist in the national awards program.

"I don't think it's possible to exist without getting involved," said Smith, who lives in Norwood.

Smith started volunteering in the schools in 1957, the year that Cloverleaf Lanes opened and he became manager. He contacted the principal at Norland High, said he planned to give out awards for scholastic achievement, and did just that.

Cloverleaf's awards program grew and grew. Smith recently hosted a luncheon for students from more than 100 schools. He also recently awarded 10,000 certificates for students who excelled in math and English.

At Hibiscus Elementary, Smith set up a program to improve attendance. All students with a perfect record at the end of this semester get two free games of bowling.

"We all need to be recognized and be loved," he said.

One of Smith's current projects is helping to arrange for first- and second-grade public school classes at the Sunshine State Industrial Park, which employs about 10,000 workers just west of the the Golden Glades Interchange.

No doubt that he will see it through. History is on his side.

Two years ago, at a run-down government housing complex in Carol City, Smith helped turn things around. He helped bring about the cleanup of neglected property and organized a community center that now provides adult classes and day care.

"You can't take out of a community without giving back," Smith said. "Some don't realize the need."

#### VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

#### HON. ANDY IRELAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct the Voice of Democracy Broadcast Scriptwriting Contest. This year more than 300,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the nine national scholarships totaling \$42,500, which was distributed among the top nine winners. The contest theme this year was "America's Liberty—Our Heritage."

The winning script from the State of Florida was written by one of my constituents, Manisha Singh, of Lake Alfred, FL. I would like to submit Manisha's work in today's RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

#### AMERICA'S LIBERTY—OUR HERITAGE

The shrill sounds of gunfire intrude upon a quiet night, erupting constantly in harsh, angry tones. Men in different shades of green cross the front line. A soldier dives into a nearby trench—grenades exploding behind him. The fury of an M-16 lashes out violating a peaceful summer day. The endless wall of a helicopter clashes with the hum of a tank in the distance.

The sharp click of the soldiers' heels turns my thoughts to reality once more. The soldier, clad immaculately in blue, turns to march twenty-one even steps on the smooth white marble. As I look out I see perfect rows of small white crosses extending over hills of green. Our heritage lies here in the souls of those who gave their lives for liberty—our most precious heritage. It also lies in the hearts of those today who remember crossing a lonely battlefield hoping to raise the American flag in triumph of liberty.

As I pass the grave of John F. Kennedy, the delicate orange glow of the eternal flame catches my eye, and I recall his immortal words—"Ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country." These words are filled with dedication—dedication to our liberty, our America. Many people devoted their lives to make our America great. One of the first of these was Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson dedicated his life to the fight for the independence of America. In drafting the declaration of Independence, he established a tradition of freedom and embodied the liberties that every American would have.

In American today, we do not have to fight for our freedom; it is granted to us at birth. This is why so many people from other nations flock to America. Over the years it has provided a home for people of many different ethnic backgrounds. It has also provided the freedom and the opportunity to succeed. In no other country in the world can a person find as many opportunities to fulfill his highest dreams.

America's liberty is the result of the dream of our founding fathers. They also left us with many magnificent symbols of liberty. I remember standing in awe of them in the nation's capital. The Washington Monument stands proudly in remembrance of the great Father of America. The enormity of the statue of Lincoln in the Lincoln Memorial is symbolic of his role in the making of American liberty.

The beauty of the Iwo Jima Memorial, brave Marines struggling to raise the Star-Spangled Banner in triumph of liberty, creates a vivid impression of the true American dream. I remember standing in front of the Vietnam Wall marveling at the number of names engraved in the cold stone. There were flowers and flags placed along the wall. I saw an elderly woman kneeling in front of the wall crying, and a young man standing beside her. The young man, in a somber tone, uttered these words—"Dad, I'm the son you never got to see."

Our heritage, liberty, is present in all of these symbols. The most symbolic, however, is Lady Liberty herself. She stands proudly representing the freedom that rings from coast to coast. She represents America's liberty, our heritage that has been handed down from generation to generation as a priceless heirloom our heritage which we should always cherish and work to preserve; our heritage—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all.

### WHY GLASNOST CAN'T WORK

**HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the New Republic has recently published a brilliant analysis of the facts of the new glasnost and perestroika initiatives undertaken by Communist Party boss Mikhail Gorbachev. I emphasize the word "facts" because, unlike so much of the reports of glasnost we read today, this one doesn't seek to praise or blame the initiatives, but to understand them within the context of one-party rule in the Soviet Union.

I strongly suggest that this piece be read by anyone who may have been caught up in the euphoria that has accompanied so many discussions of the Gorbachev program. David Satter, who wrote this piece, avoids any kind of propagandizing, for or against, but raises important questions. Again, this is a fine article and should stimulate much discussion.

At this point I wish to insert in the RECORD, "Why Glasnost Can't Work," by David Satter, in the New Republic, June 3, 1988:

#### WHY GLASNOST CAN'T WORK

(By David Satter)

Moscow—Under Mikhail Gorbachev the Soviet Union is changing. A lull in political arrests has enabled independent social organizations to proliferate in scores of cities. The regime has legalized private enterprise in the form of "cooperatives," and there are plans to give decision-making power to the heads of factories. Despite these developments, however, there is an odd sensation of events taking place in a time crystal, acted out in an abstract dimension and motivated, like some exotic fertility rite, by a guilty need to propitiate the gods rather than by any real hope of achieving a concrete objective.

The problem is that discussion remains encased in ideology. The participants in the reform battle are free to describe society's problems and even to suggest superficial causes, but they cannot identify their ultimate source in the nature of the communist system, and this lacuna forces them to fall back on wishful thinking. No matter how severely they criticize existing conditions,

they must pretend that it is possible to engender economic dynamism while preserving the Soviet totalitarian system. The elliptical nature of conversations, the half-truths and inconsistencies in official publications are, in some ways, more striking now than during the period of "stagnation," when the leadership was content to defend the existing system.

The impetus for reform in the Soviet Union came from the decline of the economy. For many years it could survive under conditions of spectacular wastefulness resulting from total centralization because it drew on unlimited numbers of workers and materials. By mid-1970s it was faced with an exhaustion of inputs. Even more serious, the West entered a new phase of the scientific revolution that emphasized not production in bulk but access to information and precise technology. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union was degrading steadily under the weight of the communist system. Food was rationed outside the major cities. It was the only industrial country in the world where life expectancy was falling (infant mortality is four to five times the rate in the West, and 16 percent of the children now being born have mental or physical debilities). Yet none of this would have been enough to motivate the present Soviet reform effort.

What mattered was that economic inefficiency began to threaten the effectiveness of the Soviet military. The danger was first described in 1985 by Marshal Nikolai Ogarkov, the former Soviet chief of staff, in a book titled *History Teaches Vigilance*, and is now acknowledged by Soviet military and political leaders. "We should understand clearly," wrote Alexander Bovin in *Izvestia* in July 1987, "that if restructuring does not succeed . . . if not socialism but capitalism succeeds in mastering the new wave of the scientific technical revolution, then the balance of forces in the world can change in favor of capitalism."

Two Russian words, glasnost (publicity, not openness) and perestroika (reconstruction), have become associated with the two aspects of the Soviet reform program. Glasnost applies to political reforms—in particular, the lifting of various restrictions on information, speech, and social organization. Perestroika, the program of changes in the economic and political mechanism, is less advanced because it bears directly on the structure of power. In response to the military crisis, Gorbachev has called for "revolutionary transformations" in the economy, but so far structural changes have been hesitant. The Party owes its monopoly of power to its concentration of both economic and political control. Any adjustment toward individual initiative weakens the Party's control even as it improves the economy.

For the moment the authorities have concentrated on glasnost, which is expected to create an air of change and the impression that finally Soviet society is going to deal with its unacknowledged problems. It is also a way of making citizens aware that more is expected of them. Culture and the press are strikingly more liberal, and the limits on allowable political activity are much wider. It would have posed a risk to the legitimacy of the system had not the regime prepared Soviet citizens by disassociating Gorbachev from past repression in a major rewrite of Soviet ideology. The new, "correct" version, which will soon be taught dutifully in every Soviet school, divides Soviet history into two parts: "genuine socialism" under Lenin until 1924 and now under Gorbachev, and

the "distortions of socialism" during the intervening 61-year period. With this ideological preparation, the faults of the system can now be acknowledged and attributed to any of the five past leaders.

In terms of its impact on the population, the most important aspect of glasnost has been the change in the press, which in 18 short months has probably published more critical articles than in the entire previous 60 years. It has stunned Soviet public opinion. The exposure of the crimes of the Stalin era goes far beyond Khrushchev. With a few exceptions—such as the Katyn Forest massacre and the fate of Raoul Wallenberg—there seems to be no hesitation about publishing the truth of Stalin's period in power. The literary monthly *Novy Mir* published an estimate that ten million peasants died in the forced collectivization of agriculture, and the Soviet weekly *Nedelya* has indicated that 50 million Soviets died as a result of Stalin's policies.

Historical truthfulness ends, however, in the discussion of Lenin. He remains a saint. There is no chance to connect Lenin to one-party dictatorship, the concentration camps, and subordination of justice to police terror. He and Stalin must be depicted as polar opposites to preserve the legitimacy of the system.

There now are relatively few forbidden topics, but the coverage of every subject must avoid any attempt to analyze underlying causes. A good example of what Soviet citizens can now read was a recent story in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* entitled "Zone of Silence," which described how Akhmadjan Adilov, the director of a collective farm in Uzbekistan and a hero of socialist labor, as well as one of the most powerful men in the republic, turned his collective farm into a slave colony with a guarded perimeter, his own private army, palace, courts, and underground prison. Adilov was protected by his ties to the top Party leaders in Uzbekistan, and in the Soviet Union, the organs of law enforcement are always under the Party's control. In the Adilov case, *Literaturnaya Gazeta* could ask how it was possible for Adilov to have committed such crimes with impunity, but was not free to give the obvious response.

Another example of the self-limiting nature of press coverage was a report in *Moscow News* about the attempted hijacking of a Soviet airliner by 11 members of the Ovechkin family, from Irkutsk, which ended with the storming of the plane and the deaths of five hijackers, a stewardess, and five passengers. The hijackers had asked to be flown to Finland, but the pilot landed the plane at an airport near Leningrad, where it was stormed by an anti-terror squad. *Moscow News* asked whether the decision to land the plane on Soviet territory had not been a costly one, but it failed to ask the much more obvious question, which was whether a family like the Ovechkins would have resorted to hijacking if they had been able freely to leave the country.

The liberalization in the press has been accompanied by a dramatic opening in the field of culture. But it still takes place within a Leninist framework. With the exception of the works of Solzhenitsyn and other émigrés, such as Vassily Grossman's novella *Forever Flowing*, which touch directly on Lenin, almost all of the suppressed classics of Soviet literature are now being published, including the works of Platonov, Zamyatin, Pasternak, and Bulgakov. The censorship that weighed so heavily in literature has been lifted. Nonetheless, political



writing remains controlled on the same lines as journalism, and so imaginative literature is deprived of its intellectual context. Artistic works are also often the subject of deliberately misleading criticism. Novels and memoirs of the Stalin period are said to indict Stalin, not socialism, and the introduction of excerpts of Orwell's 1984, which has just been published, explains that the novel is about fascism.

In an effort to inspire citizen activism, the Gorbachev leadership has also granted limited political self-expression. The authorities have released hundreds of political prisoners and, in general, are not making new political arrests. In order to be arrested, it once was enough to write an article and show it to a friend or to criticize the regime in the compartment of a train. The regime has now decided to grant some freedom of expression. Previously the authorities acted quickly to suppress any type of independent organization, no matter how insignificant. Now they appear ready to accept a limited freedom of association. For the moment the only persons who are singled out for persecution are those who undertake independent political action, such as Pairur Arikyan, an Armenian nationalist who played an important role in demonstrations in Armenia, or members of the Democracy and Humanism seminar who are trying to organize an independent political party.

To some extent this tentative political tolerance is useful to the authorities. In the past, any independent group or publication was regarded immediately as a focal point of opposition. Today, when the Gorbachev leadership is anxious to put pressure on uncooperative local authorities to implement its policies, independent organizations have suddenly become useful, especially if they lack political sophistication and can be put to work fighting against local "enemies of perestroika."

The diminution of political persecution has changed the atmosphere in Moscow and created the odd situation of a wave that is always just about to break. Every Soviet citizen who has been unfairly denied an apartment or fired from his job can now come to Moscow to seek justice in the reception halls of government organizations. These petitioners—"truth-seekers," as they are called—are arriving in thousands only to find that the press's indignation does not extend to individuals. As in the period of "stagnation," no one is interested in their complaints.

Reflecting the strange spirit of the times, Abulfazfizza Aliskerov, an Azerbaijani woman who said she had been cheated out of her home by local officials, set herself on fire on February 12 in the reception hall of the Supreme Soviet, the fictitious Soviet parliament. "I've been coming here for ten years," she shouted, "for ten years, they refuse to receive me. There is no Soviet power in the Soviet Union!"

The policy of glasnost, with its Leninist version of freedom, has had mixed results, inspiring hope, principally among the intellectuals, and fear among the workers, who have little faith that any good can come out of "the latest campaign." But a psychological change of some kind is necessary if the country is not to be thrown into chaos as the leadership begins to move to implement perestroika.

Perestroika amounts to an attempt to force Soviet citizens to work harder in a system that is inefficient because it remains under the Party's complete control. It consists of two parts—the organization of inde-

pendent businesses in the form of cooperatives or private ateliers, and the reorganization of the state sector so that each enterprise will be responsible for making a "profit" on the basis of prices assigned by the state. To a certain extent the two aspects of perestroika are expected to be complementary, the private businesses improving the quality of services and the plan for "self-financing" improving the quality of the production of the state. In both cases what is at stake is an attempt to induce Soviet citizens to show economic initiative in a party-controlled economic structure.

The first aspect of the new economic program is the development of an embryonic private sector, which the authorities hope will help to stimulate the state sector. To work in a private business, an individual must be willing to hold a full-time job in the state sector and to work in the business in his spare time. This means that the state is able to squeeze extra work out of each energetic "cooperator" or individualchik, and they, in turn, are encouraged to recruit wives and children to fill in for them in the private business. That way they make it possible for the economy to exploit untapped "labor resources."

Despite these conditions, however, Soviet citizens are slowly beginning to form private businesses, because in an economy where the services are uniformly shoddy, the rewards for independent enterprise can be high. There are now about 300,000 people engaged in individual labor activity and an estimated 150,000 people in about 14,000 cooperatives.

The appearance in the Soviet Union of private businesses that have official status and pay taxes does not represent structural change. In the past many of the services involved were provided by the black market, and so the private enterprises are only a means to bring part of the parallel economy back under the control of the state. The main importance of the independent enterprises is encouraging an environment in which citizens are expected to show initiative if they want rewards, with the same principle to be applied on a much larger scale in the state sector in the plan for self-financing, or *khozratchet*.

In fact, the plan for self-financing is the keystone of the entire economic reform and, with it, probably the Gorbachev program as a whole. It gives to the management of Soviet enterprises what they have always lacked: a measure of autonomy. Under the new law on state enterprises, the enterprise has the right to make decisions about the disposition of resources, finding suppliers and disposing of part of its production either directly or through a new wholesale trade network, with prices set by agreement under the supervision of state price formation bodies.

For the moment the reform has had virtually no effect on the economy because the place of plan indicators has been taken by "state orders," making the system even more cumbersome than before. The economic reform is not expected to go into operation fully until the next five-year plan, which begins in 1991. At that time, however, it will be full of ominous possibilities because, although it does not correct for any of the structural defects in the Soviet economy, it offers abundant opportunities to reduce the already thoroughly exploited Soviet worker to a new level of poverty while depriving him of the one thing that made his poverty bearable: the confidence that his pay was assured and he could not be fired from his job.

The most important aspect of the new system from the point of view of the individual worker is that it threatens his wages, because the wage fund will no longer be handed down to the enterprise from above but will depend on the enterprise's own income. This would be reasonable in the context of a free market. It is menacing under Soviet conditions, where the ability of the enterprise to earn an income depends marginally on the enterprise but mainly on the economic conditions created by the state.

For all of Gorbachev's talk of increasing economic independence, there is no indication that he plans to end the factors that account for the inefficiency of Soviet industry, even under conditions of reform. Under the new system, and enterprise's production must fully accord first with the economic plan, second with state orders, and only then with orders from customers. If the share of state orders is significant, as it appears it will be, the new reform will carry within itself the seeds of the Soviet economy's existing irrationality—the omissions of the planning agency, the inefficiency of the supply agency, the interference of the quality control agency, the inflexibility of ministries, and the unreliability of the Soviet railways. This will be all the more true if, as seems likely, there is no change in the system of giving absolute priority to military production, because the organization of the country as a military machine both impoverishes the civilian economy and subjects it to constant disruption.

Under these circumstances, Soviet workers may find that their salaries are subject to sharp reductions because of the enterprises' failure to make a profit, even though that failure was the result of factors completely outside the enterprise's control. Such a situation has already led to strikes and will in the future. They may also find that their security will be destroyed by rapid inflation as enterprises, in order to become "profitable" without any improvement in efficiency, simply raise prices shifting the cost of economic reform to the consumer.

Significantly, there are no signs that the authorities are thinking in terms of positive incentives to work harder, except for the vague possibility of higher pay for workers in enterprises that—according to central calculations—make a "profit." This possibility means very little in the Soviet context unless the stores are well stocked and workers who earn rubles have something to buy with them. As matters stand, meat and dairy products are being rationed all over the Soviet Union and the food supply situation is actually getting worse because of cuts in imported meat and grain. Even bread has fallen in quality.

The overwhelming impression is that if "self-financing" is to work at all, it will depend not on positive incentives to work better, but on fear of losing what little the workers already earn—and of unemployment. Soviet factories already have begun experimenting with eliminating positions and distributing some of the savings to the other workers. The Soviet Union has always prided itself on giving workers complete job security, but the plans for self-financing call for the closing of inefficient enterprises, and there is talk of eliminating 16 million jobs by the year 2000.

The Soviet Union has entered a transitional period in its history. Faced with an urgent need to inspire initiative, but unwilling to give up power, the authorities have

responded with glasnost and perestroika. They have decided to rewrite to their advantage the long-standing social contract between the Party and the Soviet people according to which the population trades obedience for security and freedom from any obligation to work. As part of perestroika the authorities now want Soviet citizens not only to work but also to accept an unprecedented level of insecurity. In return they are willing to give them more glasnost—the appearance, though not the substance, of rights.

It is already clear what institutionalized glasnost will consist of: exposures of corruptions in the press, but no system of justice for individuals; the right to criticize "in the spirit of the Party," but no public hearing for independent ideas; the right to demonstrate in the interests of the Party, and to vote for factory directors as long as the director remains subordinated to the local Party. Can the authorities persuade Soviet workers to accept economic risks in return for conditional or illusory freedoms? The answer is probably not.

All reports suggest that the workers are convinced that perestroika is a sham and that Gorbachev is the latest baltoon (blabbermouth) who "promises everything and delivers nothing" and is just trying to exploit them further. They are angry about the anti-alcohol campaign, which forced them to wait in humiliating lines and deprived them of their only escape. They are panic-stricken about the possibility of price increases, since they have barely enough to make ends meet as it is.

It is reasonable to predict that if Gorbachev seeks the funds that he needs for investment from higher prices and lower wages, under conditions in which there is a slackening of centralized control, the result will be a nationwide revolt consisting of cheating, theft, disobedience, and petty sabotage. This would worsen conditions until the central authorities were forced to give in.

The anti-alcohol campaign is a case in miniature of what Gorbachevism is attempting to do on a grander scale. It began almost immediately after Gorbachev took office. It was an attempt to solve a social problem with administrative means. The price of vodka was increased, and the production of vodka cut. At the same time police began picking up anyone who was drunk in public and factory directors were warned not to tolerate any drinking at work.

At first the campaign against alcoholism produced some successes. The consumption of alcohol was reduced, and there was a decline in work-related accidents and in crimes committed while drunk. Gradually, however, the Soviet population reacted by beginning to produce moonshine vodka, and this clandestine production has reached the point where it can no longer be controlled.

Nikolai, Shmelev, an economist writing in the monthly *Novyy Mir*, estimated that if, in the early 1980s, two-thirds of the income from the sale of alcoholic beverages went to the government and one-third to moonshiners, today those percentages are reversed without any permanent drop in the level of consumption. The loss of revenue to the government, in the meantime, has been made up by printing money.

The core of the problem is that Gorbachev is trying to induce workers to show initiative by giving them rights within a Leninist framework, whereas initiative is a characteristic of freedom and presupposes the existence of genuine human rights. The di-

lemma of people educated in Soviet society in the face of an attempt to displace them psychologically was expressed by a 33-year-old mother of three in a letter to *Pravda* on January 18, "Like many others," she wrote, "Our generation was brought up under socialism and without belief in God. One might say that socialism and its ideals were our God. . . . As a result of the policy of *Glasnost* and unrestrained criticism . . . the idea of socialism under which we have lived for 70 years and which determines our aims and the purpose of our existence has, to some extent, been discredited. I cannot speak for everyone, but my own faith has been shaken." If the reform of the economy continues and *glasnost* accompanies it, the faith of many others will be shaken too.

The only way really to introduce truth into an ideological fabric is to reject the fabric and give people rights, or to see the fabric progressively torn until there is no alternative but to dominate people through naked force.

The Soviet Union has shown an interest in Western credits to finance *perestroika*. One figure that has been mentioned is \$50 billion. It is not surprising that the Soviets have moderated the tone of their hostile propaganda and are devoting considerable efforts to persuade us to discard the "image of the enemy" when we think of them, an image that might make us reluctant to repeat the error of the 1970s in providing the credits and technology they needed to build up their military potential.

In considering the proposals for "cooperation" and "mutual help," however, we might bear in mind that the Soviet Union has the means to solve its economic crisis independently if the Party is ready to renounce expansion and share power. To have the resources necessary to help awaken the productive capacities of the population, it would be enough to decollectivize agriculture, abandon a few expensive overseas clients, and reduce the size of the Soviet armed forces to a level sufficient for security but not for intimidation.

In the absence of such steps there is no alternative, as Gorbachev has said, to *glasnost* and *perestroika*. But it is the Soviet Union's Leninist framework that these measures seek to perpetuate, and it is this framework that makes the Soviet Union aggressive and militaristic. There is no conceivable reason why the cost of maintaining it should be shared by the West.

## LET'S SUPPORT THE UNITED STATES/CANADA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT WITHOUT DELAY

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, back in 1911, the Canadian Conservative Party campaigned on the theme "Neither Trucks Nor Trade With the Yankees," in protest against a free trade agreement that the Liberal Party had just entered with the United States.

Now, 76 years later, Canadian Conservative Prime Minister Mulroney and President Reagan have signed a free-trade agreement, yielding the opportunity to open further the world's longest undefended border.

It seems that time not only heals all wounds, it enhances economic prosperity as well.

In one of his weekly radio addresses, President Reagan described this new pact as a "win-win" situation for both sides. That's undoubtedly true. Recently, we've seen a much-welcomed surge in American exports. The establishment of the United States-Canadian Free Trade Agreement would further aid our exports to the north. American businesses and industry have much to gain.

The scope of United States-Canadian trade is enormous. Most Canadians live within a 100-mile vicinity of the United States border, making it easier to trade with American businesses than with their own outlying Provinces. In 1986, bilateral trade in goods totaled \$124 billion. Companies in the United States do more business with the Canadian Province of Ontario alone than all of Japan.

Thus, the new agreement bodes well for American, and specifically Wisconsin, businesses for three reasons. We have the advantage of proximity to this new market and certainly stand to benefit from having 25 million potential customers at our doorstep.

Further, Midwestern States make what Canada needs. The core of the largest bilateral trade relationship in the world is in the Great Lakes region. Our neighbor to the north is our best foreign customer, doing over \$450 million worth of business with Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan. That's more than Canada trades with any other country in Africa, South America, Asia or even Europe.

An additional plus is that 80 percent of these exports are in labor-intensive industries, directly contributing 430,000 jobs to this five-State region.

Historically, Canada and the United States have maintained a low tariff wall compared to the rest of the world. However, for American products entering into Canada, this wall has been twice as high as for Canadian products coming the opposite direction. By lowering and eventually demolishing this wall, American businesses will be better able to compete with Canadian products.

On a per capita basis, Wisconsin is the Nation's No. 1 exporting State. Therefore, its future economic growth, like that of our country, is tied to foreign trade and the ability to be competitive in world markets. That's why we have so much to gain from the opening of the Canadian market.

Upon enactment of the Free Trade Agreement, most barriers to trade and investment will be eliminated following a three-tiered tariff reduction schedule. While some food products, apparel, and machines are subject to an immediate tariff reduction, other industries would be given several years in which to reduce their tariffs. All tariffs will be eliminated within 10 years.

Just as important as tariff reduction is the elimination of other Canadian barriers to trade and investment. These nontariff barriers exist at both the national level, with Buy Canadian rules and customs procedures, as well as the province level. Canadian provinces enjoy much more autonomy than to American States. Provincial authorities have had the ability to enact their own trade procedures



and guidelines, often leaving American exporters to deal with the whims of a provincial marketing board.

Within the new agreement, such barriers are reduced and American products are accessible in more provinces.

This agreement deserves my colleagues' support. It does much to level the often talked-about playing field for trade. Further, within the United States-Canada trade arena, our products will be granted a favored status over those coming from the rest of the world.

This is a historic opportunity to expand America's export sector. American business will benefit not from carving a bigger piece from the economic pie, but by taking advantage of a larger pie enhanced by this new trade agreement.

## THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF A PIONEERING NEIGHBORHOOD

**HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues the 50th anniversary of a pioneering neighborhood group in my district, the Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council [BYNC]. America's oldest active community organization, the BYNC was cofounded by Joseph B. Meegan and Saul Alinsky in 1939 to promote the interests of and maintain their special neighborhood community.

In its 50 years of service, this group has made a special contribution to the youth of Chicago. Its juvenile welfare committee has been acclaimed as unique and outstanding in delinquency prevention and treatment. This included the formation of Big Brother and Big Sister programs for all juveniles arrested and referred by the police. Its 34 Mothers' Clubs have sponsored educational and health programs. The education committee of local, public, and private school principals and district superintendents works together to insure quality education for Chicago. In pursuit of this goal, the council has also sponsored summer school programs in reading, modern math, art, music, and physical education as well as an excellent recreation program administered by a recreation committee which consists of 10 park and playground supervisors and subsidizes numerous holiday parties. The Career School and Seminar which the council sponsors each year for more than 1,000 eighth grade students gives them a chance to learn about job possibilities of the future from leaders of business, industry, education, labor, health, and public service. Of national importance has been the council's 1943 drive for a National/State School Lunch and Milk Program to provide all children in America a hot lunch and milk at a low, affordable cost. This program became a model for the 83,000 public and private school districts where it continues to benefit the young people of America.

Another major accomplishment of this organization has been the redevelopment of the Chicago Stock yards area which has attracted

the additional industry and jobs essential to the community. While pursuing this goal, the council conducted a title search of 13,500 homes in the community and maintains up to date records on the ownership of all homes, apartments, business, and industrial properties which make up the Back of the Yards Neighborhood. For the benefit of its neighbors, the council also worked in conjunction with more than 200 local insurance agencies to provide low cost tenant and homeowners insurance. It has also worked with Illinois' Commonwealth Edison Co. and local contractors to modernize electrical service at low cost to owners of more than 5,000 homes and sponsored a communitywide effort to prevent the loss of lives and property by selling more than 11,000 smoke alarms at cost in the council's office. This spirit of community involvement has also been encouraged in the young through the junior citizens committee in area schools which participate in community betterment programs.

The contributions that the Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council have made to the community during their 50 years of service are immeasurable. I am sure my colleagues join me today in recognizing and honoring the council's dedication and commitment to the people of the Back of the Yards and congratulating them upon the 50th anniversary of their founding.

## INDIA'S REPRESSION DESERVES ACTION

**HON. WALLY HERGER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has long had a commitment to ensuring freedom and democracy for individuals around the world. Indeed, an inscription here in the Capitol states that: "Wherever liberty is in chains, and people are fighting for it, they are fighting for America."

It is for this reason that I have been concerned with the well-documented instances of human rights violations that have been taking place against innocent Sikh men, women, and children in the Punjab state in India.

The Sikh minority has been the most productive minority in India. While representing only 2 percent of the total population of India, the Sikh agricultural community produces 73 percent of India's wheat reserves, and 48 percent of her rice reserves. Unfortunately, the Indian Government denies the Sikh people even the most basic freedoms. Innocent Sikhs continue to be arrested and held without charge for up to 3 years by the Indian secret police, often undergoing torture and even death at the hands of their interrogators. Elections are not allowed, entire rivers have been diverted out of the Punjab, and a strict state of emergency was imposed, one which resulted in the arrest of more than 23,000 citizens who participated in the peaceful general strike.

Additionally, India's growing alignment with the Soviet bloc has been well documented. The Indian Government has supported the

Communist Sandinista government in Nicaragua, voted with Fidel Castro and Ethiopian President Mengistu at the United Nations—in fact, India votes against the United States in the United Nations more often than the Soviet Union, perhaps as much as 94 percent of the time—and recently purchased an attack submarine from the Soviets capable of carrying cruise missiles and torpedoes. There have also been charges that Indian advisers have actively participated in the Soviet war in Afghanistan. Clearly, the current Government of India is no ally of the United States.

The vast majority of Sikhs are hard-working and peaceful people who only seek the rights and privileges that are provided to other minority groups in India. It is time that our Nation speak out in support of this oppressed minority and send a strong signal to Prime Minister Gandhi that we cannot tolerate indiscriminate violations against human rights. The United States should not do business with those nations which ignore the issue.

We might make our stand on human rights clearer by suspending most-favored-nation status for the Indian Government. My colleague, Representative BILL MCCOLLUM, recently suggested that this would be an important first step toward pressuring the Indians to respect the basic rights and freedoms of the Sikh minority. Most-favored-nation status should be reserved for those countries which adhere to the same internationally recognized standards of human rights that we demand of our other allies, and those countries whose behavior and conduct toward the United States remains reasonable and supportive. India meets neither of these standards.

As I have emphasized in the past, India has it within their grasp to address the concerns expressed by a number of my colleagues. The Sikh people have repeatedly stressed that they are willing to negotiate with Mr. Gandhi for their God-given rights and freedoms. I would hope that both sides would work toward this goal, peacefully, and quickly.

## SURGEON GENERAL'S REPORT SUPPORTS SLOWING CIGARETTE ADDICTION BY ADJUSTING CIGARETTE EXCISE TAX

**HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, as we are well aware, cigarettes and other forms of tobacco are dangerous. They are responsible for more than 300,000 premature deaths each year in the United States alone. They are addicting. They are associated with heart disease, lung disease, cancer, and burns. They are the largest single preventable cause of illness and death in this country. A substantial excise tax on cigarettes would dampen demand for the product, and thus reduce many of the problems and costs associated with tobacco use.

Despite the danger of these products and the economic costs associated with the devastating problems they cause, the cigarette excise tax has not kept pace with the rate of inflation. In 1951, the tax on a pack of ciga-

rettes was 8 cents. In 1982, Congress passed legislation to raise the tax from 8 cents to 16 cents a pack. However, even with this change, the cigarette excise tax rate has lagged far behind the increase in the cost of living over the past few decades. Currently, Federal tax as a percent of cigarette price—including tax—is at 16.6 percent, the same percentage as it was in 1975. The result has been increased costs to the individual and society.

On January 7, 1987, I introduced a bill to double the cigarette excise tax from 16 cents to 32 cents a pack. Not only would this action reduce the Federal deficit, but it would discourage people from starting to smoke.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Federal revenue generated by an increased cigarette excise tax would be over \$3 billion per year. It would also save billions in health costs in the years to come. The cost of medical care for smoking-related disease amounts to an estimated \$21 billion per year. This represents 7 percent of the total national expenditures on personal health care. An even greater economic toll is the \$37 billion lost in productivity and earnings to U.S. business every year. It is estimated that the cost of smoking-related illness to Medicare and Medicaid will exceed \$5 billion a year.

The use of tobacco products by schoolage children, adolescents, and adults affects the well-being of our society. Preventing the initiation of tobacco use must be a priority. The Surgeon General's report, "The Health Consequences of Smoking: Nicotine Addiction," released on May 16, 1988, makes it clear that the nicotine in tobacco is an addictive drug, and deadly to one's health, just like heroin, cocaine, and other controlled substances. While we are trying extraordinary measures to solve the drug crisis, we should at least consider a modest adjustment in the cigarette excise tax in order to discourage consumption.

The Surgeon General's report says that the cost and availability of cigarettes are important in the "initiation and maintenance" of smoking. According to the report, "human cigarette smokers can be motivated with positive and negative cost incentives." From an economic perspective, when the price of a commodity increases, the intake of the substance decreases. Therefore, an increase in the cigarette excise tax will lead to decreased consumption. The Surgeon General further indicates that the "widespread ready availability and relatively low cost of tobacco products have contributed to the much higher rates of mortality associated with tobacco."

By providing a negative cost incentive, we will be providing an impetus for current smokers to quit. Several years ago, it was estimated that an 8 cent a pack increase in taxes would lead to 1.8 million quitting, or not starting to smoke. This would include over 400,000 teenagers, more than half a million young adults 20 to 25, and nearly half a million adults 26 to 35.

In the long run, an increase in the cigarette excise tax from 16 cents to 32 cents would decrease the health care expenditures of society in general, and the Federal Government in particular. However, even more importantly, it will save lives.

## EIGHTEENTH ANNUAL FESTA ITALIANA

### HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House, and particularly those from New Jersey and New York, that on June 11 Italian-American organizations in the State of New Jersey and thousands of Italian-American citizens of the Garden State will join together in a celebration of their unique heritage at the 18th annual Festa Italiana at the Garden State Arts Center in Homdel, NJ.

Just as past festivals have attracted large crowds, this one promises to be an outdoor extravaganza of good Italian food, music, entertainment and cultural pride. The purpose is to remind Italian-American citizens of New Jersey of their rich cultural and ethnic heritage, and to raise funds to benefit the Garden State Cultural Center. The center provides free programs in the arts for school children, senior citizens, disabled veterans, and the blind from all over New Jersey.

Under the chairmanship of Anthony P. Lordi, Sr., of Linden, the 18th annual Festa Italiana continues a tradition started in 1971 under its first chairman, Alphonse A. Miele. Successive chairmen of the event were Frank A. Campione, Renato R. Biribin, Louis J. DiGirolama, Jr., John A. Appezzato, Modesta Farina, and John Gatto.

This year Carmen L. Urso of Linden will serve with Frank Sciarillo of Chatham as co-chairmen of the event. Anthony Carpinello is the chairman and Charles S. Piazza is co-chairman of scholarships; Ralph Champa is the ad book chairman and Frank Guida co-chairman, Salvatore J. Finelli is the treasurer; Mary Finelli is the recording secretary.

Many talented musicians, dancers, singers, and performers will entertain throughout the day under the chairmanship of Guilio Carnevale and his cochairpersons, Beverly Geiger and Maria Auriema.

Festa Italiana is famed for its food, and Eileen Di Nizo and Patricia De Prospero are in charge of this part of the celebration. Other prominent Italian-Americans also are serving on the committee. They include Rev. Joseph Maffei of St. Anthony's Church in Elizabeth, Elaine and Renato Biribin, Chris Albanese, Al Vecchione, Robert J. Tarte, Cesarina Earl, Louise Sciarillo, Lee Carlo, Michael Vacca, John L. Geiger, Carmen Ligato, Mario Farraro, Ann Bon Martin, Marion Sporaco, Anthony De Sopo, Joseph Martino and Lucy Schifano.

The New York-New Jersey metropolitan area is home to millions of Italian-Americans. The two States rank first and second, respectively, in the number of their citizens with Italian backgrounds. They add to the richness and variety of America, and they have contributed to the growth of the Garden State and the pride that Italian-Americans take in their culture and heritage.

## A FOND FAREWELL TO ALBERT J. "VOJTECH" SVOBODA, SR.

### HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and say farewell to one of my constituents, Mr. Albert J. "Vojtech" Svoboda, Sr., of Cicero, IL. Mr. Svoboda passed away last Thursday, May 26, 1988, and left us all with a loving memory of his kindness, his hard work, and his sense of fun.

Albert Svoboda—or "Tata" as he was affectionately known by his children and grandchildren—represented what I believe to be the best qualities in Americans. Born in 1902 in a small village just north of Prague, Czechoslovakia, Mr. Svoboda emigrated to the United States in the 1930s to seek the freedoms that would soon be denied his country by the Nazis. Settling in Cicero, IL, Mr. Svoboda devoted himself to the realty business in the Chicagoland area and made a good life for himself and his children.

As a testimony to his industriousness and hard work, Albert Svoboda was elected to serve as the chair of the South Lawndale-Crawford Real Estate Board in 1958. He then went on to become president of both the Southwest Multiple Listing Service (1960-62) and the 26th Street Real Estate Board (1964-68) in Chicago, and was very much involved in the neighborhood development of the greater Chicago region.

As chairman of the Democratic Council on Ethnic Americans, I am always on the lookout for Americans who exemplify our rich ethnic, immigrant tradition. Albert Svoboda was such an example. While proud to be an American, he never forgot his Czechoslovak roots and made certain his children could speak his native language and his heritage was passed on to future generations. He was an active member of the SOKOL athletic organization, the LYRA singing society, and many other Czechoslovak fraternal and social organizations. His love of Czech music, dancing, and culture enriched all who came in contact with him and endeared him to many.

Mr. Speaker, I know his friends and family from the old Czechoslovak neighborhood in Cicero will miss him greatly. I offer my condolences and salute a great Ethnic American—Albert J. "Vojtech" Svoboda, Sr.

## RESOLUTION SUPPORTING IRANIAN BAHAI'S

### HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the 144th anniversary of the founding of the Baha'i faith. On May 23, 1844, in a small house in the city of Shiraz, Iran, the prophet Bab announced the beginning of the Baha'i faith.



Since that day, Iranian Baha'is have suffered severe persecution, solely for their belief in the divine authority of the founder of the faith. By 1950, the Bab's first disciple and 20,000 others had died at the hands of fanatical mobs acting under orders of the Muslim clergy. Unfortunately, this savagery continues today. Over the past 8 years, nearly 200 Iranian Baha'is have been executed, thousands more imprisoned, and many subjected to torture on account of their religious beliefs.

In 1982 and 1984, Congress adopted concurrent resolutions urging the Government of Iran to uphold the rights of all its nationals, including members of the Baha'i faith. Today, along with my distinguished cochairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, TOM LANTOS of California, and 81 of our colleagues, I am introducing a similar measure. I urge the rest of my colleagues to join us in sponsoring this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is time again for Congress to join over 100,000 American Baha'is in support of their brothers in Iran and elsewhere throughout the world.

#### HONORING ALAN PRESS

### HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Alan Press, who will assume the presidency of the National Association of Life Underwriters [NALU] on September 29, 1988.

Alan Press joined the Guardian Life in 1956, immediately upon graduation from Columbia College. He has been an agent, supervisor, and was named general agent in 1964. His agency has been awarded the Guardian's coveted President's Cup four times, and is always in the top five of Guardian's over 100 agencies. He is a past chairman of the Guardian's field advisory board.

Mr. Press is a past president of the New York City and New York State Associations of Life Underwriters. He has chaired NALU's special committee on the taxation of life insurance. Mr. Press has testified on behalf of NALU before committees of the U.S. Senate, House of Representatives, and the New York State Commission on Insurance, Banking, and Financial Services concerning "Taxation of Life Insurance," "Tax Treatment of Employee Benefits," and "Decontrol of Financial Institutions."

Mr. Press has been a frequent contributor to LAN magazine, authorizing a series of articles on A.L. Williams that ultimately formed the basis of the NALU video, "Rhetoric vs Reality." "Dealing with Replacement" a collection of his LAN articles, was published as a brochure by NALU. Over 500,000 copies of the brochure have been distributed.

He has been an editor of Probe magazine. His articles have also appeared in Best's magazine and the Financial Planner. He has been a main platform speaker at the Million Dollar Round Table, GAMC's LAMP, and the CLU Forum. He has spoken to life underwriter meetings in over 35 States. Memberships include AALU, ASCLU, GAMC, and MDRT.

Mr. Press has taken leadership roles in many civic and service groups. Such service includes: past president or chairman of the Jewish Big Brothers of New York, Northern Section; New Jersey Association for Children With Learning Disabilities; Demarest (NJ) Democratic Club, and the Demarest Zoning Board.

Mr. Press lives in Demarest, NJ, with his wife Hanna, and their three children. I take great pleasure in honoring him today.

#### A TRIBUTE TO REV. CHARLES WARD

### HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want today to call to the attention of my colleagues the passing of a faithful minister of the Gospel and an outstanding citizen of my district, Rev. Dr. Charles William Ward, Sr., pastor of First Baptist Church in Raleigh, NC.

A native of LaGrange, GA, he received his high school education at East Depot Street High School. He completed his higher education at Morehouse College; Howard University School of Religion; Bowman Gray School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, NC; the Urban Training Center, Chicago, IL; and Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC.

Ordained by Rev. Martin Luther King, Sr., Charles Ward led numerous congregations with great effectiveness, including First Baptist Church of Raleigh, where he has served for the past 29 years. He also presided over the Raleigh Ministerial Association and the Raleigh Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance.

Charles Ward was a civic leader, who assumed a leadership role in the civil rights movement from his earliest days in Raleigh. He was at the forefront of the struggle to end segregated schools, and the community's progress owed much to his ability to negotiate and conciliate across racial lines. He continued the fight for justice and equality while serving 9 years as president of the Raleigh-Apex chapter of the NAACP, and as president of the Raleigh-Wake Citizens Association.

Charles Ward was a humanitarian, striving for the betterment of others. In 1966, he founded the Raleigh Inter-Church Housing [RICH] Association. He organized the construction of Rich Park, a section 221(d)(3) housing community, which today provides affordable housing for 100 low-income families. At the time of his death, he was working with the city of Raleigh and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to convert church property into a shelter for the homeless.

Charles Ward was a man of quiet strength, well-spoken, well-read, and thoughtful. He did not need to raise his voice to be heard, for the strength of his convictions and the power of his wisdom commanded attention. He was a man to whom I and many others learned to listen closely, and whose counsel we sought and valued greatly.

Charles Ward's life was a blessing to his family, his congregation, and his community.

We mourn his passing and rejoice in the good he did among us. In the apostle's words, we "thank God upon every remembrance of him."

#### INTRODUCING BUDGET STRUCTURE ACT

### HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the most pressing problem facing the Federal Government today is the enormous deficits that we have accumulated in recent years. Year after year, the President has submitted, and the Congress has enacted, budgets for Federal Government operations in which expenditures far exceed revenues.

On numerous occasions, we have resorted to unabashed gimmickry in an attempt to hide the real extent of the annual deficit. Notwithstanding the deception generated by the gimmickry, the deficits have continued to accumulate. They are real. They are serious. And, they must be dealt with.

It is time for the Congress and the President to face up to the real problem, rejecting the gimmicks and making the hard choices. We cannot do this if we don't demand that the budgets submitted by Presidents and enacted by Congress contain honest figures that reflect the true status of the Federal Government's fiscal activities.

I am today, along with the ranking minority member of the Government Operations Committee, Congressman FRANK HORTON, introducing the "Federal Budget Structure Act of 1988." This bill is the result of several years of study by the Committee on Government Operations with the assistance of the General Accounting Office.

The Budget Structure Act is not a magic wand. It will not eliminate the Federal budget deficit. That will only be done when the President and the Congress determine to adopt balanced revenue and spending policies. Rather, this legislation will be a tool to help the President and the Congress meet that objective by providing better and more relevant information on the revenues, expenses, and financing requirements of Government programs and activities.

Our legislation will require that the budget submitted by the President be a unified budget which contains an operating budget and a capital budget, which also distinguishes between Federal funds and trust funds. Though not included in this legislation, if this procedure is adopted, we would also propose to conform the Congressional Budget Act to require that the annual congressional budget resolution be presented in a similar structure.

This four-part budget approach, distinguishing between capital investments and operating expenses, and between trust and nontrust fund amounts, will enable us to focus clearly on where the budget deficits and surpluses are and will give us better information on which to make rational choices in determining national priorities. We are offering this legislation as a first step toward restoring integrity and reliability in the Federal budget process.

We urge all Members to study it carefully and would welcome any thoughts and comments you might have.

## SUPPORT FOR H.R. 2470

### HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 the House voted overwhelmingly to pass H.R. 2470, the Medicare Catastrophic Coverage Act of 1988. Due to illness, I was unable to cast my vote on this important measure. However, had I been in attendance, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 2470.

While I did not support this measure in its original form, the conference committee made remarkable progress in improving this bill; 29 million elderly Americans and 3 million disabled Americans receive Medicare benefits. Although this program has been very successful, many people still are left with enormous medical bills that must be paid out of pocket. H.R. 2470 takes a decisive step in eliminating much of these crippling medical costs.

First, the measure vastly simplifies the Medicare Program. Recipients no longer have to worry about hospitalization costs after 60 days. Under H.R. 2470, beneficiaries will make only one payment and be covered for the rest of the year. This payment will be \$564 in 1989 and be capped at \$600 in 1990.

Second, physician or outpatient services will be capped at \$1,370 beginning in 1990. Medicare will pay all approved charges beyond this amount.

Third, the bill offers a prescription drug benefit. Many elderly people have complained of the high cost of prescription drugs. When the bill is fully implemented in 1993, 80 percent of prescription drug costs will be paid by Medicare after beneficiaries have paid a \$710 deductible. In 1991, 50 percent of costs will be paid above \$600.

Most importantly, the new Medicare Program has a self-financing system incorporating a flat fee method to be paid by all beneficiaries and a progressive method based on tax liability.

Although I am supportive of this measure, I still have serious concerns on some of the bill's provisions. My greatest concern is whether the new program will be able to remain revenue neutral in the coming years as the number of Medicare recipients is expected to grow rapidly. Additionally, I worry that elderly beneficiaries may be forced to pay higher and higher premiums. Finally, the measure does not address the issue of long-term nursing home care that many older Americans are unable to afford.

While H.R. 2470 is not the final answer to all of the problems facing Medicare beneficiaries, it is an important victory in the battle for effective, affordable health care for older Americans.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JUNE 5, 1988—NATIONAL SHUT-IN DAY

### HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to let my colleagues know that this coming Sunday, June 5, 1988, will be a very special day for many of their constituents. Today, an important piece of legislation, House Joint Resolution 145, declaring June 5, 1988, as "National Shut-In Day" was passed by the House of Representatives.

I am very happy to be the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 145. I was first alerted to this important issue by Mrs. Judy Boone of Logan, WV, who is the president of the National Shut-In's Day Association. Now in her 80's, Mrs. Boone has set an example of community service for all of us to follow. In addition to her many other civic duties, she has worked tirelessly on behalf of shut-ins all over the country, and especially in our home State of West Virginia.

For those who have never heard of "shut-ins," they are those unfortunate citizens who are physically confined to their own homes or nursing homes due to disability or illness. They are literally "shut in" their environment. They are members of society whose once productive lives have been impeded by illness or accident. This is not to say, however, that they cannot continue to contribute greatly to society, only that they need to be recognized and given the opportunity to do so.

One of the most important aspects of this legislation is the recognition that "shut-in's" have a wealth of knowledge, experience and friendship to share. The observance of "National Shut-In Day" is one way to show that we in Congress have not forgotten these important members of our society.

I would like to thank all my colleagues who joined me in cosponsoring this resolution. And my special thanks goes to Judy Boone of Logan, WV, who has worked tirelessly in helping to realize this goal. Happy National Shut-In Day, Judy.

## BELLS TO RING ON MEMORIAL DAY

### HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today, the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, SONNY MONTGOMERY, and I introduced a resolution renewing the significance of our Memorial Day holiday.

This measure calls on the President to issue a proclamation each year calling on all churches, community centers, schools, synagogues, and other public buildings in the United States to toll their bells for 1 minute beginning at 11 a.m. on Memorial Day in remembrance of the men and women who died defending our Nation and freedom.

June 3, 1988

Over the past weekend, I am sure many of us participated in Memorial Day festivities in our local communities, including parades, heroic speeches, wreath laying ceremonies, patriotic concerts, and picnics. The true meaning of Memorial Day is slipping away from us. More and more Americans are viewing Memorial Day as a day off, a time of relaxation and leisure rather than for taking the time to reflect and pay tribute to our American service men and women who sacrificed their lives for our freedom.

Chairman MONTGOMERY and I believe strongly that by urging the ringing of bells in our communities for a minute on Memorial Day, it will help Americans to realize that the real purpose of this holiday is to pay tribute to those who have given so much for their country.

Our hope for the future has been made possible because our American service men and women have made sacrifices in order to secure freedom for our Nation. The ringing of our community bells is a befitting way to observe Memorial Day for years to come.

Please join Chairman MONTGOMERY and I as a cosponsor of this resolution to renew the significance of this important holiday with the ringing of community bells on Memorial Day.

## AMERICANS BEING SHUT OUT OF HOUSING MARKET

### HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, in September 1987, the National Housing Task Force was established to reexamine America's housing policies. In March, the task force released its report entitled "A Decent Place To Live" which, among other things, found that increasing numbers of American families cannot afford to purchase a home. The American dream of owning a home is becoming an impossible dream for many first-time homebuyers.

One Federal program that has been particularly successful in promoting homeownership is the Federal Housing Administration [FHA] single family mortgage program. Created in 1934, FHA has helped low-, moderate-, and middle-income Americans purchase homes by insuring low-downpayment mortgages with interest rates and terms that are more attractive than those available in the conventional mortgage market. The beauty of this program is that the FHA insurance pool is funded by FHA premiums—no Federal funds are involved at all.

Despite the success of this program, more and more Americans are being shut out of the housing market. This was one of many issues the task force addressed, and today I am introducing legislation implementing some of the recommendations of the task force that will make it easier for Americans to get into the home market. This legislation has already been introduced in the Senate by Senators SASSER and HEINZ, and has been endorsed by the National Association of Homebuilders and the Mortgage Bankers Association.



## LOWERING THE FHA DOWNPAYMENT

Despite a general decline in mortgage interest rates, homeownership has declined every year since 1980. While the percentage of decline appears small—from 65.6 percent of households as homeowners to 63.8 percent—it means that nearly 2 million fewer families own homes today than would have, had the prior rate been sustained. Ironically, there are millions of Americans who can afford to pay the monthly mortgage payment on a home. The problem is they can't come up with the large downpayments needed to qualify for a mortgage. Once inside the house, they can comfortably pay their mortgage. They just can't get their foot in the door to begin with.

Under current law, FHA insures 97 percent of the first \$25,000 for a home and 95 percent of the balance. Thus, on a \$100,000 home, FHA would insure \$95,000 of that amount. The homebuyer has to come up with a \$4,500 downpayment.

For first-time homebuyers, my bill would permit FHA to insure 97 percent of the entire home valuation. This means the buyer would only have to put down 3 percent of the home's value, or, in the above example, \$3,000. For many people, this could spell the difference in getting into the market. For other homebuyers, the bill would allow FHA to insure 97 percent of the first \$50,000 of the home's value and 95 percent of the balance. Under this formula, the person above would have to come up with a slightly lower downpayment of \$4,000.

The bill also authorizes a demonstration project allowing FHA to insure a loan to a first-time homebuyer for the entire purchase price plus the closing costs of a home. The standard downpayment would still be required, but it would be incorporated into the loan and be repaid by requiring an additional payment along with the regular monthly mortgage payment over a 3-year period.

## ADJUSTABLE RATE MORTGAGES

Under current law, FHA may insure adjustable rate mortgages [ARMs] whose interest rate can only be adjusted by 1 percent a year. And only 30 percent of the loans insured by FHA can be ARMs.

This bill provides FHA with more flexibility with adjustable rate mortgages. It permits FHA to insure ARMs that can be adjusted by 2 percent per year. The lower interest rate would result in more people getting into the housing market. The bill also stipulates that the interest rate could not increase by more than 5 percent over the lifetime of the loan. Finally, the bill removes the volume cap on the aggregate number of ARMs that FHA may insure in a year.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not a panacea for America's housing crisis. There are other housing needs that must be addressed, such as the declining stock of low income housing and rental units, and the plight of the homeless. My bill is just a drop in the bucket, but it's a response to one unique problem among the many housing problems we have in this country.

## TRIBUTE TO ALDEN BERNARD CAMPEN

## HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, in our long history our Nation has been blessed with many individuals who have given of themselves more than could rightly be expected of even the most generous of people. Throughout my life, both public and private, I have been fortunate to know and work with many such individuals. But I have known no finer individual than Alden Bernard Campen, San Jose businessman, community leader, and champion of downtown redevelopment.

When Alden passed away on May 7 at age 76, he left a living legacy in the hearts and minds of his friends and family, friends and family which are the city of San Jose.

Alden was a driving force behind San Jose's urban rebirth at a time when redevelopment, renewal, and rehabilitation had yet to become either fashionable, profitable or, to many, even desirable. The difference in Alden was that he believed in his city and in its people. But more than that, he backed his belief with his financial resources.

In the early 1950's, for example, a large orchard went up for sale. Alden admired it and thought it would make a wonderful park. He urged the city to buy it, but the city couldn't afford it. So Alden and the Renzel family bought it instead. Years later, when the city could afford it, Alden and the Renzels sold it to the city for exactly what they had paid for it—even though the value of the land had appreciated considerably. That orchard is now Kelley Park.

In 1961, Alden was honored by the city of San Jose for "outstanding accomplishment in the field of community improvement." And indeed, if you consider the organizations in which he was a member, a contributor and an active participant, you would discover that Alden often seemed to embody the concerns of the entire city.

Alden was a member of the Japanese American Citizens League, the Southern Education Conference, the American Civil Liberties Union, the San Jose Peace Center, and B'nai B'rith. Alden served as a member of the city's redevelopment agency, as an officer of the Water and Power Users Association, as a director of the San Jose Housing Authority and the Parking Advisory Committee, and as a member of the Mayor's Committee on Human Relations.

Mr. Speaker, Alden's entire life was devoted to human relations and the betterment of his city, San Jose. We were all bettered by his contributions to San Jose, and, as a result, we are poorer for his loss. I ask then that my colleagues join me in remembering a unique individual who epitomized a true neighbor, a true friend, and a true American.

## CONGRATULATE THE PASADENA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND CIVIC ASSOCIATION UPON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ITS FOUNDING

## HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my congratulations to the Pasadena Chamber of Commerce and Civic Association upon the eve of its centennial celebration.

On April 6, 1888, business leaders from the Pasadena community joined together to form the articles of incorporation for the Pasadena Board of Trade, the chamber's parent organization. Their efforts were timely, dedicating themselves to improving development and the quality of life for the rapidly growing community of Pasadena.

The board of trade, during its tenure from 1888 to 1918, played an instrumental role in the establishment of the Tournament of Roses Association, an organization which has for nearly 100 years annually produced the rose parade on New Year's Day.

The board of trade has also been actively involved in many civic developments such as the city's public library, high school, municipal water and light systems, electric car line between Pasadena and Los Angeles, city hall, numerous parks, fire department expansion, and the building of the Colorado Street Bridge.

In 1981, the board of trade and chamber became one, and since then have championed many essential and aesthetically pleasing public and private services, such as, the civic auditorium, the Pasadena Freeway, and Angelus Crest Highway.

Through reorganization efforts guided by the chamber, Pasadena's business center is now home to many electronic and precision industrial firms, as well as headquarters for many financial corporations.

The Pasadena Chamber of Commerce has distinguished itself as a leader in business development and for the improvement of the quality of life in Pasadena.

## HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN TIBET—CONGRESSIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CAUCUS HEARING

## HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 3, 1988

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the congressional human rights caucus held a most significant and important hearing on the topic of human rights violations in Tibet. Joining me on that occasion were a number of our distinguished colleagues: Congressman JOHN PORTER of Illinois, cochairman with me of the congressional human rights caucus; Congressman WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD of Michigan, the ranking minority

member of the Foreign Affairs Committee; Congressman CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH of New Jersey; Congressman FRANK MCCLOSKEY of Indiana; Congressman BENJAMIN A. GILMAN of New York; Congressman ROBERT K. DORNAN of California; Congressman JOSEPH J. DI- GUARDI of New York; and Congresswoman LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER of New York.

This was our second hearing on Tibet. Last September the congressional human rights caucus provided a forum for His Holiness the Dalai Lama to make his first public political statement outside India since 1959 when he fled to that country from Tibet. During the course of that hearing he outlined for the first time his important and now well-known Five Point Peace Plan. Just after his appearance before the human rights caucus—in an almost unprecedented action—both the House and the Senate called on the government of the People's Republic of China to begin discussions with His Holiness the Dalai Lama on the full range of issues involved in the case of Tibet.

A number of very serious and disturbing events have unfolded in Tibet since our last hearing. A large number of individuals have been killed, maimed, wounded, detained, arrested.

In reporting to my colleagues in the Congress about this important hearing on Tibet, Mr. Speaker, it is important to underscore that the congressional human rights caucus is the umbrella human rights organization in the Congress. The caucus has as its operating theme the notion that human rights are indivisible. Our concern for human rights has been equally strong with respect to South Africa and the Soviet Union, Cuba and Chile, Iran, and Tibet.

I also want to underscore, Mr. Speaker, that we are firmly committed to improving good relations with the People's Republic of China. We have the highest regard for Chinese culture and civilization, and we fully applaud the improving relations between the United States and China.

But it is the view of the congressional human rights caucus that strategic or other considerations must not be an excuse for sweeping human rights violations under the rug. As a matter of fact, it has been the consistent activity of the congressional human rights caucus and many other human rights organizations to expose Soviet human rights violations which led simultaneously to the improvement of human rights conditions in the Soviet Union and to the improvement in United States-Soviet relations.

We expect and hope for a parallel pattern and outcome with respect to China. Our relations with China must be put on an adult basis. The honeymoon is over. It is an index of our respect for the American relationship with China that we are prepared to deal with problems in our relations with China.

Mr. Speaker, as the congressional human rights caucus was meeting to consider human rights violations against the people of Tibet by China, just across the hall the Foreign Affairs Committee was conducting a hearing on the Chinese missiles that have been placed on Saudi Arabian soil, upsetting the strategic balance in the Middle East.

It was also intriguing that as our hearing focused on Tibet—one of the unique cultures on our globe where religion and national identity are so delicately intertwined and so inseparably conjoined—we were witnessing a similar pattern unfolding in Poland, another place where one also finds this unique intertwining of nationality and religious commitment.

It was significant, as well as ironic, that one of the chief witnesses at our hearing on Tibet was the Right Honorable Lord David Ennals, member of the British House of Lords. On the very morning of our hearing in Washington on Poland, another member of the House of Lords, the Right Honorable Lord Nicholas Bethel, was arrested for expressing his concern for Polish human rights.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress, I would like to place in the RECORD a number of important statements that were made during the hearing of the congressional human rights caucus on human rights conditions in Tibet. First, I would like to insert in the RECORD statements made at the outset of our hearing by several of our distinguished colleagues:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN PORTER, CO-CHAIRMAN OF THE CONGRESSIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CAUCUS

During today's hearing, the Congressional Human Rights Caucus will continue to focus attention on the human rights violations occurring in Tibet. As many of you remember, the Human Rights Caucus hosted a congressional forum last September at which the Dalai Lama, Tibet's spiritual and political leader, outlined his five-point peace plan proposal.

While none of these points called for the independence of Tibet, the Chinese government accused him of fomenting such a movement. Unfortunately, news of the Dalai Lama's visit and five point plan sparked riots in Tibet's capital of Lhasa later that month, and again in March. Two Americans, who were travelling in Tibet when the September riots broke out, spoke to the Human Rights Caucus just after their return. They reported widespread violence, even against monks, and other human rights violations including the infanticide of Tibetan newborns.

The history of Tibet and its political relationship with China is intricate and complex. However, the fundamental human rights issues involved cannot be ignored. We have a moral obligation to speak out for the Tibetan prisoners and citizens being denied basic rights such as education, religion, and the right to maintain their over 2,000 year-old civilization.

Today's witnesses include Richard Gere, a brilliant actor and Chairman of the Tibet House; the Honorable Lord Ennals, a member of the opposition Labour Party in the House of Lords with a history of Tibetan involvement; Tenzin Sangpo, a Tibetan who was tortured and whose brother was killed in the March riots; Paul Ford, a representative of Amnesty International; and Eric Schwartz, a representative of Asia Watch.

I look forward to hearing the testimony of this distinguished group of witnesses. I appreciate these witnesses taking the time to join us today. And, I want to thank and commend my honorable co-chairman of the Human Rights Caucus, Tom Lantos, for his tireless efforts on behalf not only of the Tibetan people, but of human rights in general.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, MEMBER OF THE CONGRESSIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CAUCUS AND RANKING MINORITY MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, members of the caucus, ladies and gentlemen: I am pleased to participate today in this hearing of the congressional human rights caucus on human rights in Tibet. Chairman Lantos and the other members of the caucus are to be congratulated for their pursuit of this topic.

I also commend the witnesses for their interest and dedication to the cause of human rights in Tibet.

The Chinese Government must realize that the human rights situation in Tibet is a legitimate subject of international concern and attention.

Instead, the Chinese appear to feel that unrest in Tibet threatens their sovereignty over the area and that international attention would further complicate this issue.

The only way for international concerns about Tibet to be resolved is through an open and complete examination of the situation.

I urge the Chinese Government to investigate the situation in Tibet and also to open the area to government officials, scholars and the press.

The International Community has a stake in the survival of Tibetan culture and the welfare of the Tibetan people.

I hope this hearing will help alert the Chinese Government to our seriousness in resolving this issue.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, CONGRESSIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CAUCUS AND MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

I want to commend the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Illinois for holding this important hearing at this appropriate time.

Yesterday, at Arlington Cemetery, I had the sad and moving responsibility to give the eulogy for Captain Leslie, the helicopter pilot recently shot down over the Persian Gulf.

He was a young man in the prime of his life.

His wife, a very intelligent and beautiful woman, is expecting their first child.

That ceremony at the cemetery was one of the most difficult moments of my life.

Captain Leslie made the ultimate sacrifice because he wanted to make sure that his family and loved ones could lead their lives the way that they choose.

He was fighting against a tyrannical force that has little regard for human life.

It would cut down an innocent child as swiftly as an army recruit.

People become little more than mere numbers on a page and the whole human element that Captain Leslie was trying so desperately to preserve becomes insignificant to an authoritative rule steeped in anger and hate.

Back in January we received a list of over 140 names and short histories of Tibetans that were arrested by the Chinese during the October demonstrations.

The Chinese and their spokesmen are fond of claiming that they have released 59 demonstrators and only 15 remain in prison.

We have repeatedly requested for over a period of 3 months the names of those allegedly released—mere numbers to be raised



and used at will by some—important individual human beings to others.

Today we will be witness to and hear stories of more grief.

Grief brought on by rulers attempting trying to prevent people from living the lives that they choose.

Lives that cherish individuality and religious freedom.

I welcome our witnesses here today.

It is one of the great pleasures of fighting for human rights in Congress that we have so many allies in other facets of American life. None is perhaps more committed and more effective than the distinguished American actor, Richard Gere, the star of "An Officer and a Gentleman." Mr. Gere is the founder and chairman of Tibet House. For the last 5 years, since his initial encounter at Dharmasala with His Holiness the Dalai Lama, he has been one of the international champions of human rights for Tibet. The first statement that I ask be placed in the record is a summary of the excellent statement made by Richard Gere:

#### STATEMENT OF RICHARD GERE

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, I am honored to be here today in this historic building to discuss something that has obsessed my life now for several years. There are very few protectors on this planet for the Tibetans. You can't sell a lot of Coca Cola or Porsches in Tibet. There is no reason—other than morality and right—to care about the Tibetans.

Let me very briefly tell you how I got involved with Tibet. I have had a very long association with Buddhism, which led to my going to Dharmasala, India, about 1980. I was a close friend of John Avedon who wrote the primer on Tibet and His Holiness the Dalai Lama, "Exile from the Land of Snows."

Having had spiritual yearnings like any human being trying to find some honest way to live on this planet, I was told that I could have an audience with His Holiness the Dalai Lama if I waited a week. I was very happy to have that audience, and while I waited for that week I traveled among the Tibetan community in Dharmasala. I visited a children's village and was told of the horror that they had gone through—having left their country as refugees with absolutely nothing and fleeing to a third world country. They had no help, no friends, no protectors.

The contrast between what I saw and conditions twenty years earlier was most impressive. At this point they did have schools; they did have libraries; they picked themselves up and they have done extraordinary things. They built monasteries. They put together a health system and a new constitution and created a whole new way of life for themselves—a pattern of the way things will be when they return to their homeland.

My audience with His Holiness is something that everyone should experience, and I hope that you all will have that opportunity someday. One waits in anticipation for the moment when you are brought into the presence of His Holiness. He is larger than one would expect. He is like a farm boy. He came from a farming family in Amdo Province from a very small town, Taktse, near Kubum Monastery. He smiles and laughs. He finds it essentially impossible to tell you anything bad about anyone—including the Chinese. This is the first indication of what is so extraordinary about the Tibetan people. They have learned the science of the mind to such an extent that they retain no hatred—even for their oppressors. As we

hear the Tibetans here speak, I think you will get a sense of this.

Mr. Speaker, the second witness to appear before the congressional human rights caucus hearing was the Right Honorable Lord David H. Ennals. Lord Ennals is a former member of the British Parliament, and he held a number of responsible positions in labour governments: Minister of State for Health, 1956-70, Minister of State at the Foreign Office, 1974-76, and Secretary of State, member of the Cabinet, for social services, 1976-79. In 1983 he was made a life peer and became a member of the House of Lords. Presently, he is opposition, labour party spokesman for Overseas Affairs in the House of Lords.

Lord Ennals has a long record of friendship for China, and he was a consistent advocate for China's entrance into the United Nations. He has also had a long association with Tibetans through his refugee work, particularly with the "Ockenden Venture," of which he recently served as chairman. As president of the United Kingdom Gandhi Foundation, he also has close ties with India.

Lord Ennals visited the People's Republic of China just a few weeks before he appeared at our hearing. During that trip he spent more time in Tibet, where he left his official Chinese guides and made extensive investigations on his own of the human rights situation there:

#### STATEMENT OF THE RT. HON. LORD DAVID H. ENNALS—OVERSEAS SPOKESMAN OF THE LABOR PARTY IN THE BRITISH HOUSE OF LORDS

We are very grateful to the Government of the People's Republic of China for enabling us to visit Lhasa, Chengdu and Beijing on a two week fact finding visit from March 29th to April 9th to study the present very disturbing situation in Tibet. We are also grateful for the time the authorities gave to our exchange of views. We were conscious that we were foreigners discussing particularly sensitive issues and appreciated that we were able to discuss with the Chinese authorities our assessment of the situation, frankly, and we hope constructively.

Although the visit was short, a considerable amount of preparatory briefing was undertaken to enable us to make the maximum use of the time available and, in the event, we talked with a considerable number of people from senior government officials to members of the public.

We were able to piece together the complicated issues which led to the serious demonstrations in September, October 1987 and in March 1988.

Several observations emerged from our visit. First, I was disturbingly impressed by the very large number of Chinese population in Lhasa. Lhasa is really two cities: the ancient Tibetan City, and a modern Chinese city. One is on top of the other. From my own experience it brings to mind the words "colonialism" and "apartheid." It was clear that Tibetans do not want to be occupied by China.

Second, there is a difference in the standard of living between Chinese and Tibetans. Tibetans are poor by comparison with Chinese or with Tibetans in any other part of the world. The Chinese have made improvements in the areas of education and health, but they have not narrowed the gap between Tibetans and their own people.

Third, the size of military presence is very large and intimidating. Although we saw few armed troops, it is quite evident from

the considerable amount of off-duty troops who are always in the streets of the Chinese city and the size of the barracks just outside Lhasa that Lhasa is a garrison town. The roads always have military traffic on them. There is a regular daily troop-carrying flight which we encountered at Lhasa.

Fourth, there have been gross breaches of human rights of Tibetans.

Reports of the numbers involved in the demonstrations and those killed and injured, particularly in the March demonstration, have varied greatly according to the source, and we were repeatedly informed by the authorities in Tibet that 'only a handful of trouble makers' had been involved in the March demonstration. We were the first independent visitors since that major demonstration on the 5th of March, and we can emphatically state that: The demonstrations involved 10,000 people. A Chinese soldier, 16 Tibetan Buddhist monks, and 2 Tibetan laymen are known to have been killed and scores were injured, including a number of Chinese soldiers. Two Chinese restaurants, notorious for refusing to serve Tibetans were destroyed.

Further demonstrations have taken place since March. Demonstrations led by nuns occurred on April 17 and April 24. We do not know how large the demonstrations were. The Chinese reported the arrest of twenty nuns. Based on previous experience, the number involved could be much larger.

There has been a policy of mass detention. Individuals continue to be detained at night. Many are identified from the extensive videoing of the crowd, which is common practice in China, and from following checks of everyone's movements by the cadres of the work units. Officially, the Chinese say that fifteen people have been detained, but I am sure that the actual number is not less than 2,000. No one knows where they are. Often the first news families receive of a detained relative is when they are summoned to the hospital mortuary to buy back the body for 150 or 200 dollars. This used to be a common practice during the Cultural Revolution.

Many of the bodies are unrecognizable because of torture. Sometimes eyes have been taken out and limbs severed. Based on the collection of bodies, there appear to be two "routine" forms of torture. One is the use of a club with big nails sticking out of the end, which either kills or mutilates. The other is "electric cow prodders" used to inflict extreme pain and temporarily disable an individual. With the wire coils unravelled they are used to strip the flesh from legs and arms.

At first we treated these reports with reserve but the consistency of the reports, the calibre of the witnesses and their undoubted fear left us in no doubt as to the veracity of the reports from people who had relatives who had been detained.

Now in Lhasa there is a sense of fear and frustration. Fear of the Chinese authorities and frustration with the apparent hopelessness of the plight of the Tibetans.

The opportunity of being received at a high level in Beijing and Lhasa, of exchanging views with the representatives of the Government of China (including the Panchen Lama) of meeting monks, lay people in Lhasa and exchanging views with the Dalai Lama in Dharmasala and in London was unique at a time when visitors and journalists are severely restricted in visiting Tibet.

In view of what we believe to be the gravity of the situation we felt a heavy responsibility to put forward proposals for consider-

ation by the Chinese authorities to avert a worsening crises and bring about a long term solution based on the principles of the United Nations and Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The time is now ripe for serious discussion about the present and the future. There is no need to be pessimistic about the prospect of genuine negotiations. For their part China has now become a constructive force for good, is playing a positive role in the world and has shown a high degree of statesmanship in its handling of the future of Hong Kong.

As for the Tibetan people, our visit there based on a great deal of evidence from those in Tibet and elsewhere confirms the impression that there is a very wide measure of support for The Dalai Lama and his Five Point Peace Plan. To this should be added the indisputable fact that The Dalai Lama is a man of peace.

We also felt that there was growing respect, both in Beijing and Lhasa, for the constructive role played by the Panchen Lama who has given the most realistic account so far of the events of March 5th and has used his influence to secure the release of 59 of those demonstrators detained in the autumn.

In our view:

1. The Chinese Government should seek an early opportunity to resume talks about the future of Tibet with The Dalai Lama and his political and religious advisors. It may take a long time for an agreement to be reached and, in the course of discussions, both sides must be prepared to make such adjustments in their existing positions. Discussions on an open agenda would be advisable. A solution would bring great credit to China as well as satisfaction to the Tibetan people.

2. Without delay the Chinese Government should arrange for the Panchen Lama to spend more of his time in Tibet.

3. The Chinese Government should recognize the urgency of the necessity that human rights are restored in Tibet and an amnesty for political detainees should be declared.

4. The Government should announce a review of the continuing build up of Han Chinese in areas long populated by Tibetans, with their totally different history and culture.

In our view there is a crisis which demands a rapid response. The denial of Human Rights in Tibet must be dealt with not by continuing repression and force, but by statesmanship and in a genuine wish for peace. Urgent action is needed to avert a situation that would bring further damage to China's reputation and to the Tibetan people.

The third witness who appeared before the hearing was Tenzin Sangpo, a Tibetan who was imprisoned and tortured for some 20 years by Chinese authorities in Tibet. In the March 1988 rioting in Lhasa, his younger brother, a Tibetan monk, was killed by Chinese troops in the Jokhang Temple:

#### TESTIMONY OF TENZIN SANGPO, VICTIM OF HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSE IN TIBET

Tibet, a peaceful buffer state between India and China has been transformed into a vast military camp. Over one million people have lost their lives due to killings, tortures, starvation and suicides under the brutal rule of the Chinese. Today there are only around two thousand monks and nuns in Tibet. What happened to the hundreds of

thousands of monks and nuns we had before 1959?

In an effort to annihilate Tibet's cultural identity, the Chinese are sending young Tibetan children away from their parents to China. Every year, children between the ages of 8 and 11 are selected from the lower primary school and are not allowed to return to Tibet until they have finished their studies. Parents are allowed to visit their children once after three years. The whole idea is to brain wash these children and destroy the Tibetan identity.

I have served 15 years in a jail and five years in probation within the jail compound. Altogether I suffered 20 years in Chinese jails. The reason why I was arrested was that I was one of the pro-independent activists in 1959. I was mainly kept in Drapchi prison, near Lhasa. The prisoners have no rights whatsoever. In a cell of 10' x 12', 10 to 12 prisoners had to sleep. Despite a poor diet, every prisoner is expected to do vigorous labor: cutting stones, brick making, carrying mud and so for 12 hours every day.

I was an eyewitness to 9-11 public executions each year for a period of seven years. Many people who were not able to bear the torture and ill treatment by the Chinese in the jails had to commit suicide. Some prisons were popularly known for the number of suicides by the prisoners either by cutting their throats or by jumping into the rivers while working on road construction. Hundreds of the survivors have gone completely mad. Since the prisoners were not given enough food to eat, many had to steal the pig slop and horse fodder. In some places prisoners ate leaves of trees, certain grasses and underground worms and insects. The prisoners are not allowed to write their relatives. This is only a brief account of the life in the prisons under China.

There have been 54 uprisings in Tibet since 1959, four of these between September, 1987 and March 1988. All the uprisings are clear demonstration of the Tibetan people's opposition to Chinese rule and their determination to continue the struggle for their legitimate rights. The demonstration in March 5th was the biggest of all since 1959. It is believed that more than 20,000 people took part. When some of the monks shouted anti-Chinese slogans, the specially trained Chinese soldiers threw a kind of grenade inside the Jokhang temple which made the monks unconscious and then they started shooting inside the Temple. The grenades were definitely different from tear gas. The next day people found pieces of hands, ears and other human flesh inside the Jokhang Temple. Many of the statues and thangka paintings of the temple have been damaged. It pains me so much to describe that my youngest brother, Ven. Kalsang Tsering was killed in the Jokhang that day. He was 36 years old.

More than 5,000 people have been arrested since September 1987. Although many of them have been released, they were severely beaten and forced to give the names of other participants. Many people have seen dead bodies being removed from the prisons. Those who went to claim the dead bodies of their relatives for traditional cremation were told to pay an amount of 600 yuan.

In order to stop further bloodshed, His Holiness the Dalai Lama has made a five point peace plan for Tibet's future. I sincerely hope that the U.S. Congress and the administration will pressure the Chinese to positively respond to this peace proposal.

Thank you.

The final two witnesses at the congressional human rights caucus hearing were Washington officers of two internationally known and internationally respected human rights organizations. They have extensive knowledge through their organizations of human rights conditions in Tibet and in the People's Republic of China. They are Eric Schwartz, program director, of Asia Watch and Paul Ford, codirector of the Washington Office of Amnesty International USA.

#### STATEMENT OF ERIC SCHWARTZ, PROGRAM DIRECTOR OF ASIA WATCH

In February 1988, the Asia Watch Committee published a report on human rights in Tibet, based largely upon information gathered in Tibet. In that report, we identified a number of practices that, taken together, represent a pattern of serious human rights abuses. These include:

1. stringent restrictions on all political utterances and actions, enforced by an extensive surveillance network;

2. arrest and imprisonment of peaceful political activists for public expressions of opposition to the Chinese role or Chinese policies in Tibet, or for political support for the Dalai Lama or Tibetan independence; such arrests often take place at night, and family members are often not informed;

3. unfair procedures in political trials that do take place;

4. torture during interrogation, including use of cattle prods; we also found that mistreatment is not confined to interrogation, and that prisoners are subjected to various forms of abuse during confinement;

5. restrictions on freedom of religion that include government regulation of the numbers of monks in monasteries; government exercise of the power to refuse entry into the monastic ranks; an apparent prohibition on teaching and propagation of Buddhism in most of Tibet, and government efforts to take Buddhist education out of the hands of the monasteries;

6. patterns of discrimination against the Tibetan population arising out of the growth of the Chinese population in Tibet, including discriminatory policies with respect to housing, access to services, freedom of movement, education, and economic opportunities;

7. demographic policies that have had the effect of moving Tibetans into disadvantageous economic and social positions vis-a-vis the Tibetan plateau's Chinese populations in the cities and towns.

Our report also discussed the Chinese suppression of demonstrations that began peacefully in September and October 1987, during which the authorities arrested hundreds of Tibetans, declined to provide information on the status of individual prisoners, and expelled the foreign press.

The concerns of our report were heightened by the events of March 1988, during which several hundred Tibetans are believed to have been arrested at the end of the Great Prayer Festival in Lhasa. Moreover, dozens of Tibetans are believed to have died in connection with the events of the late 1987 and early March.

Unfortunately, the Chinese authorities continue to make it nearly impossible to obtain accurate information on conditions in Tibet, although the information we do have is not encouraging. At least hundreds are believed to be in prison, and the Chinese presence in Lhasa is believed to be overwhelming. As I have mentioned, the Chinese have provided almost no information



on individual prisoners—their names, their locations, the accusations against them—and have severely restricted access to the territory.

Although they have given almost no information on the status of nearly all of the hundreds of Tibetans believed to be detained, the Chinese have announced that seven Tibetans have been charged in connection with the events of last fall and early this year. Asia Watch is very concerned about the fairness of any trial proceedings that might take place in these cases, and will be asking the Chinese government to permit us to observe one or more trials if they take place. We would strongly urge the U.S. Department of State to make a similar request.

The Chinese government would send an important signal about its desire for reconciliation and promotion of respect for human rights by permitting such trial observers, and by opening the territory to the media and international organizations concerned with conditions in the territory.

**STATEMENT OF PAUL FORD, CODIRECTOR OF THE WASHINGTON OFFICE OF AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL USA**

I appreciate this opportunity to speak before the Congressional Human rights Caucus on the situation in Tibet.

While Amnesty International has human rights concerns in the Peoples Republic of China in general, my remarks will be confined to the human rights situation in the Tibet Autonomous Region (TAR). The TAR comprises roughly half of the territory populated by Tibetans. Amnesty International takes no position regarding the status of Tibet vis a vis the People's Republic of China. Since the PRC government controls this region, Amnesty International has addressed its concerns to this government concerning the human rights situation in Tibet. In particular, we are concerned with the (1) the imprisonment of persons for pursuing their political and religious beliefs in a non-violent manner; (2) the abuse of prisoners (both political and criminal); and (3) the use of capital punishment.

Since the Chinese invasion and takeover in 1959, Tibet has seen serious and widespread deprivation of human rights. This was particularly so during the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (1966-1976). After the death of Mao Zedong more liberal policies were instituted. In particular, Tibetans were allowed relative freedom to practice their Lamist Buddhism.

However, last year Tibetan political unrest became more manifest, and the Chinese authorities responded with a return to repressive measures. In particular, several hundred people are reported to have been detained in Lhasa, the capital of the Tibet Autonomous Region. These detentions were

the government's response to three demonstrations and a riot in late September and early October.

The demonstrations were led by groups of monks calling for Tibetan independence. On October 1, the arrest of peaceful demonstrators triggered a major riot in Lhasa. According to eye-witnesses, many people were killed or wounded when police started shooting at the crowd. (Chinese officials have denied that the police opened fire.) Although we do not know exactly how many people were detained, Amnesty International has received names of 120 people arrested during and after the demonstrations. Amnesty International welcomed the government's announcements that 72 detainees were released between October 28 and January 28. Official sources reported that "over 10" people remained in custody at that time. However, private sources estimated that up to 600 were detained at the time.

On March 5, at the conclusion of a major Buddhist prayer festival, several thousand people took part in a riot which lasted some 12 hours. Police were attacked, vehicles burned, and shops ransacked. Dozens of young monks who took part in violent clashes with security forces are said to have been arrested during the riot, and many arrests were carried out during the following days. A total of at least 20 people are believed to have died during the clashes that day. (The Chinese government admits to only 5 deaths.)

It is difficult to determine how many Tibetans remain detained following these series of demonstrations and riots. One official government figure is 200. Other private sources estimate from 700 to 840. One foreign press report estimated more than 100 monks were among those detained following the March riot. It is also unclear whether some or all of those released following the fall disturbances were re-arrested. Amnesty International has called on the PRC government to clarify who has been released and who is still detained, and to make known charges brought against those currently detained.

Amnesty International is concerned that many of those arrested and detained were ill-treated. With regard to the fall disturbances, some sources report that those detained have been held incommunicado, without access to their families or lawyers, and some are alleged to have been ill-treated by police. Indeed, we have received corroborated testimony indicating that considerable violence was used by the police to arrest peaceful demonstrators, particularly on October 1 and 6. During the March 5 riots, we have received unconfirmed reports that security officials stormed the Jokhang Temple and severely beat some of the monks inside, some of whom died as a result. We have inquired with the PRC gov-

ernment about this incident but have received no reply.

The official New China News Agency announced on March 11 that three Tibetans, (Yulo Dawa Tsering, Tenba Tsering, and Jigme GYATSO), all held since December, were charged with "counterrevolutionary crimes" and "disturbing public order during the anti-Chinese riot" of October 1. There has been widespread concern that Mr. Tenba Tsering and Mr. Gyatso could be executed. Amnesty International is unconditionally opposed to the death penalty, which is in wide use throughout the People's Republic. Yulo Dawa Tsering is considered by Tibetans to be a "living Buddha". The government claims that he has confessed to having made "reactionary statements in favor of Tibetan independence" and speeches to foreigners in order "to obtain worldwide support in bringing about Tibetan independence as soon as possible." Apparently Yulo Dawa Tsering was arrested following his participation in a video being made by a visiting Italian.

On April 19, Lhasa Radio announced the new arrests of four male youths by the Public Security Bureau on April 16. The names were given as Lobsang Tenzin (a university student), Tsering Dhondup (a seminary student), Gyalsen Chopel (a tradesman), Sonam Wangdu (a Lhasa resident). They are accused of involvement in the killing of a policeman during the March 5 riot. Based on past Chinese practices where convictions of murder are involved, it is considered very likely that the government will execute these young men, an action to which Amnesty International would be opposed.

We continue to receive reports of arrests since the March riots, and are concerned that many of these people may be non-violent political and religious activists. On May 5, Reuters reported that 18 nuns were arrested following an April 17 demonstration around Lhasa's Jokhang Temple. Amnesty International is seeking information concerning the circumstances of their arrest and their conditions of detention.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amnesty International has yet to receive responses from the PRC to our inquiries about the disturbances in Tibet of the last few months.

Accordingly, we ask the US Government: To encourage Chinese officials to publish who is detained and who is released;

To release those prisoners who have been imprisoned solely for pursuing non-violently their political or religious beliefs, an internationally guaranteed basic right; and

For other detainees, to promptly charge them and grant them a fair trial.

